

# THE ECLECTIC REVIEW,

FOR APRIL, 1826.

---

Art. I. *Essays on the Evidences, Doctrines, and Practical Operation of Christianity.* By Joseph John Gurney. 8vo. pp. x. 566. Price 10s. 6d. London, 1825.

IN noticing this volume before we have reviewed Mr. Gurney's recent work on the Religious Peculiarities of the Society of Friends, we are guided partly, perhaps, by inclination; but it seems the natural order, to consider first the grand points on which we are agreed, before we proceed to discuss those minor ones on which we find ourselves compelled materially to differ. 'Throughout the present volume,' says Mr. Gurney,

'I have endeavoured to avoid the discussion of any of those points in religion which can with any reason be regarded as peculiar or sectarian. I have considered it to be, on the present occasion, my sole duty, to arrange and unfold the testimonies borne in Scripture to those *primary religious principles* which the generality of the Christian world unite not merely in believing to be true, but in regarding as of *essential* importance to their present and everlasting welfare.'

The Evidence and Authority of Revelation are the subject of the first five Essays: the remaining seven are devoted to the following leading topics. 'The Scriptural Account of the Divine Being. The Union and Distinction in the Divine Nature. The Scriptural Account of the Spiritual Adversary. The Scriptural Account of Man. The Scriptural Account of Jesus Christ—in his pre-existence; during his abode on earth; and in his reign. The Redemption of Mankind. Faith and Obedience.' This arrangement is simple and comprehensive, and far preferable to that of most divinity systems, which, affecting a greater precision, run into so many subdivisions. The subjects of the first two Essays fall under the first general head of Theology, the title of Calvin's first book, —*De cognitione Dei*. The next two relate to the actual condition of Man. The last three essays treat of the Mediatorial

VOL. XXV. N.S. 2 C.

intervention for his Recovery, comprising all the subjects of Calvin's second and third books. Here Mr. Gurney stops; and it is precisely at this point that the differences between pious Christians of the various Protestant communions begin, their religious peculiarities relating almost entirely to the external means of salvation. Thus it is, that while those peculiarities destroy the uniformity, they do not affect the unity of the Catholic Church.

To these topics, we say, the religious differences which separate real Christians almost entirely relate; for it would not, we apprehend, be going too far to assert, that every sectarian division of the Protestant Church has been founded on a peculiarity of sentiment relating either to the nature of the visible church, the sacraments, or some point of discipline. Putting the modern Unitarians out of consideration, the rise of Independency, the great Nonconformist secession, the origin of the Baptists, the Quakers, the Methodists, and the subdivisions of Presbyterianism, may all be traced to a dissent from the corruptions and usurpations of the Secular Church with regard to the nature or administration of the outward means of grace. Whatever theological peculiarities may attach to these several denominations, they will neither be found to have originated the separation, nor to be essential to the sect. The Arminianism of the Wesleyan, the Calvinism of the Baptist, are found, the one in the articles, the other in the received theology of the National Church. And even the characteristic tenets of Quakerism respecting the cardinal doctrine of Divine Influence, do not so essentially differ from the opinions of many learned and pious men of other communions, as the views of Friends on this subject vary among themselves. Differences respecting the extent of redemption, the nature of faith, predestination, and the rest of the five points, have been the fruitful source of controversy in every age and in every church. The indivisible Church of Rome has not been less divided and subdivided against herself by contending schools, doctors, and orders, than the Protestant Church has been; nor can the smallest existing sect pretend to an entire uniformity of opinion among its members on these points. But then it is consoling to reflect, that nine parts out of ten of the various controversies which have been maintained by theologians on the subjects alluded to, have consisted of metaphysical reasonings and opinions; and of the remaining tenth, one half has been made up of disagreements chiefly verbal. There cannot be a more striking proof of this, than the fact, that the practical and devotional writings of some eminent persons of every communion, not excluding even the corrupt Church of Rome, have



become the common property of the Church Catholic, and the palpable evidences of its unity. The writings of Bernard and a Kempis, Pascal and Fenelon, Leighton and Beveridge, Baxter and Owen, Watts and Doddridge, Scott and Fuller, are now found side by side in the same library, and circulating among all classes of religious readers. And the work before us affords another testimony to the essential unity of the faith, by shewing how immeasurably more important are the points on which real Christians agree, than those on which they differ. We are not insensible of the objections which lie against Quakerism as a system, but we rejoice to find that its errors will all come under the *fourth book* of Theology; and we are not at liberty, therefore, to class Mr. Gurney and his friends, the evangelical part of his society, among either heretics or schismatics,—according even to the definition of a learned Romanist: 'For there is to be considered, as to the Church, the head and the body. From the head, there is no departure but by doctrine disagreeable to Christ the head. From the body, there is no departure by diversity of rites and opinions, but only by the defect of charity.\*' Words worthy of something more than a golden inscription: they claim to be engraved on every heart.

If ever the various denominations of Protestantism are to be brought into closer union, it must be, we apprehend, not by means of a greater harmony of opinion on minor points, at least in the first instance, but by having their attention more fixed on the grand points on which they agree. 'The pious bishops Ridley and Hooper,' says Howe, 'had differed somewhat angrily about ceremonies, but were well agreed upon a martyrdom at the stake.' In proportion as the attention is concentrated upon the substantial and prominent parts of religion, we feel to have more in common with those from whom we dissent. This is the true antidote to sectarian feeling. And in proportion as we give their due prominence to these common grounds of faith, we disarm the hostility of prejudice. Such a work as the present is admirably adapted to answer this most desirable purpose,—to fix the attention of Friends, and of readers of every denomination, on the cardinal doctrines of the Christian faith, divested of every thing technical or sectarian in either sentiment or phraseology. The instances are exceedingly few and unimportant in which the Author's religious peculiarities have given the slightest colour to his statements;

---

\* Cassander de Officio Pii, &c. quoted by Howe. Works, Vol. IV. p. 146.

but throughout the volume, we meet with abundant marks of a catholic spirit, as well as a fervent and enlightened piety.

In the introductory Essays on the Evidences of Christianity, originality was not to be looked for. Mr. Gurney has contented himself with a very brief outline of the argument pursued by Lardner, Paley, and Michaelis, with regard to the credibility and external evidence of Revelation; considering that, to the sincere inquirer, those evidences which are the matter of observation and experience, are not only the most accessible and intelligible, but the most satisfactory. This is true; but if it was necessary, in such a work, to advert to the lower species of evidence, it was advisable to exhibit it in all its force. Mr. Gurney commences his work with some remarks on 'the strong antecedent probability of a Divine Revelation.' In exposing the unreasonableness of infidelity, this consideration may have its use; for, in fact, the bare possibility of a Revelation lays every man under the most sacred obligations to examine the truth of the Christian religion. All presumptive reasoning, it might be shewn, is in favour of a Divine interposition of this nature. But to Mr. Gurney's readers in general, the fact that a Revelation has been given, will probably appear more nearly approaching to self-evident, than the hypothetical probability adduced in support of the fact; and it strikes us as a great defect, though a very common one, in theological reasonings, to attempt to strengthen indisputable propositions by proofs less certain, or at least less obvious, than the corollary they are employed to establish. The entire force of the *à priori* argument in favour of the credibility of Revelation, which Mr. Gurney has glanced at, few of his readers will be qualified to appreciate. With regard to the believer, it is superfluous. To bring it to bear on the sceptical inquirer, a much wider view of the subject and a more extended induction would be requisite.

It seems to us that Mr. Gurney, in these introductory essays, has not had very distinct ideas as to the class of readers to whom he was addressing himself. There are two very different objects which a writer may have in view in treating of the evidence of Christianity: the one is, to vindicate it against the attacks of infidels, to expose and confute their objections, and to satisfy the doubts of the sincere inquirer; the other is, to arm the believer against the assaults of infidelity, by putting him in possession of all the evidences of his faith. In the one case, in which the Writer has to gain over a jealous enemy, he has the choice neither of his ground nor of his weapons; he can argue only from what the other party admits, and this circumstance narrows the basis of his reasonings. He has to set out with a concession infinitely derogatory to the claims of Christianity.



yet subservient, like the humiliation of its Divine Author to, its final triumph,—the concession, for argument's sake, that its truth is questionable, its authority capable of being resisted. In the works of Lardner, Paley, Watson, and other powerful Apologists, Christianity appears placed on its trial. We fully admit the obligations of the Christian world to such writers, and the invaluable nature of their labours. With the *Horæ Paulinæ* more especially, every one ought to be familiar. Still, it must be acknowledged, that a different style of treating the evidences of Christianity, a less subdued tone, a more prominent and explicit assertion of its authority, a more becoming exhibition of its Divine character, are desirable in works addressed to the young and the ingenuous, to religiously disposed persons, or to that large class who, having no doubts as to the truth of Christianity, are yet too slenderly provided with the means of repelling infidel cavils. In presenting before them a general view of the deistical controversy, it never ought to be implied, that the duty of believing is suspended on debateable points, on probabilities and rational presumptions. A feeling of uncertainty may otherwise be awakened by the very process of demonstration. We are inclined to think, indeed, that the place for most advantageously treating of the evidence of Christianity, is the close, rather than the commencement of a work like the present. The first inquiry that naturally presents itself, relates to what the religion is; and not till this has received its solution, are we prepared to enter into the inquiry, now become all-interesting. Is it true? The objections of the infidel against such a religion are then seen in their true character, and the historic and presumptive evidence by which those objections may be met, assumes its proper place as subordinate and auxiliary to the internal evidence by which Christianity commends itself to every man's conscience.

Mr. Gurney thus commences his fifth Essay :

‘ Satisfied, as I trust we now are, of the Divine origin of that holy religion of which the Law was the introduction, and the Gospel the perfect revelation, it still remains for us to examine a very important question; namely, whether the *record* of our religion contained in the Old and New Testaments, is also to be regarded as of Divine origin—in other words, whether the Holy Scriptures were given by inspiration of God?’

Here it is supposed that the reader has been conducted by the chain of reasoning in the preceding essays, to the conclusion, that ‘ Christianity is the religion of God,’—that is, a Divine religion,—yet, without being precisely informed as to the nature of the religion, or being satisfied as to the inspiration

of the Scriptures, on which the fact of a Revelation hinges. Such a state of mind, it is obvious, cannot exist: the case, therefore, is purely a supposititious one. The subject of the fifth Essay ought to have come under consideration immediately after the genuineness and authenticity of the Scriptures had been established. But we object less to this defect in the arrangement, than to the way of stating the inquiry, and the manner of dealing with the fictitious reader who is escorted through the different branches of the subject, on the ground of the incorrect representation which it gives of the true source and nature of belief or unbelief in the human mind. The logical process which is supposed to terminate in satisfaction up to a given point, bears no analogy to the rise and progress of religious conviction in the mind of a sceptic; nor is it by piecemeal that the claims of Revelation are admitted or rejected. We must seriously object, also, to such a style of expression as the Author's candour has led him to employ at pages 102 and 103. 'On the whole,' he says, 'we may safely accede to the sentiments of Archbishop Newcome,' &c. And again:

'Now if there be nothing trivial in the epistles of Paul, and nothing really erroneous in the Gospels, the objections made on the opposite supposition to the Divine origin of the whole Scriptures, will fall to the ground at once. Let us, however, take up that opposite supposition, and grant for a moment, that one or more of the evangelists have actually fallen into mistake in their statements of some minor circumstances, and that certain parts of Paul's epistles are so absolutely destitute of weight, that they *could* not have been given by inspiration. Such facts, if facts they were, could not be pleaded against the authority of the Bible *in general*. We are in possession of positive evidence of a highly satisfactory nature, that the writings of the Scriptures were inspired, and inspired *for the purpose of promulgating religious truth*; and this evidence is by no means counteracted by the supposed circumstance, that, in the composition of certain small parts of their works, *considered to be non-essential in reference to that object*, they were left to the unassisted exercise of their own natural powers.'

If we understand Mr. Gurney aright, he means to contend, that the inspiration of the sacred writers as teachers or promulgators of religious truth, would not be invalidated by their having fallen into mistake as historians, or by their having introduced into their writings, some references of a private and personal kind,—as 1 Tim. iv. 13. With regard to the former case, we are happily under no necessity of arguing the point. 'Most of the apparent contradictions referred to in the objection,' Mr. Gurney justly remarks, 'have been satisfactorily reconciled on critical grounds; and the few which cannot be so readily explained,' he adds, in terms somewhat too timid



and qualified, 'would probably be found, were all the circumstances precisely known, to involve no real error.' We are really not aware of any occasion for this guarded statement, this admission of doubt and difficulty. We are persuaded that there does not exist the slightest ground for the supposition of error, however immaterial, in any part of the evangelical narrative: if there were, we admit that neither the veracity nor the inspiration of the evangelist would be disproved, but the character of the document would be greatly deteriorated. As to the objection founded on the personal references in the Epistles, it appears to us scarcely to deserve attention. The use to which Paley has turned these brief and scattered notices, shews that they are not unimportant as establishing the genuineness of the Apostolic writings and the truth of the history. And there is the clearest proof that the plenary Inspiration to which the Apostle lays claim in delivering the will of Christ to the churches, did not restrain him from adverting to topics not included in the instructions with which he was Divinely intrusted.\* Not only does Mr. Gurney appear to us to attach too much weight to this objection, which he satisfactorily combats, but the expressions which we have cited are adapted to leave on the minds of his readers a painful or injurious impression, as if the Author were not himself perfectly satisfied by his own reasonings. We detest and deprecate dogmatism, but the language of hesitancy and indecision is not less to be reprobated in a religious teacher. Your *if*, it has been said, is a great peace-maker; but sometimes it has proved a great mischief-maker.

On that difficult subject, the nature of Inspiration, Mr. Gurney makes the following sensible remarks.

'Much discussion has arisen among theologians, respecting the degree in which it was imparted, and the mode in which it operated; and the distinctions which have been formed on the subject are at once refined and numerous. Inspiration, I would submit, is the communication to the minds of men of a divine light and influence, by which they are either miraculously informed of matters before unknown to them, or by which ideas already acquired through natural means, are presented to their memory, and impressed on their feelings with an extraordinary degree of clearness and force; and by which, further, they are often led to promulgate to others, either in speaking or in writing, that which has been thus imparted to themselves. Such being a general definition of Inspiration, it must evidently vary in degree and in the method of its operation, according to the circumstances under which it acts, and the subjects to which it is applied.'

\* See 1 Cor. vii.

' When the ideas communicated to the inspired person, and by the inspired person to others, were altogether new, and his knowledge of them attained only through an immediate and supernatural discovery, it seems probable that the very words in which those ideas were communicated to others, must also have been suggested by the Holy Spirit. Such I conceive to have been the case with the prophets when they found themselves constrained to predict events which were not only concealed in the bosom of futurity, but were of so singular a nature that they were probably very little understood by those who predicted them. See for example, Isa. vii. 14. ix. 6. liii. Such also may probably have been the case with Moses when he described the creation of the world; and with the Apostles when they communicated to their disciples those doctrinal mysteries of which their knowledge was derived exclusively or principally from immediate Revelation. But, as far as relates to the more simple didactic parts of Scripture, as well as to the greater part of its historical narrative, we may presume that the sentiments and facts impressed upon the minds of the writers, were promulgated by them in their own words, under the especial and extraordinary *superintendence* of that Divine Remembrancer, who by no means superseded their natural talents and acquired knowledge, but enlarged, strengthened, protected, and applied them. Now although the inspiration under which the several parts of Scripture were written, may have been differently modified, according to their respective characteristics, yet, if these premises are correct, we may safely deduce from them the general inference, that the *whole contents of the Bible are of Divine authority*.'

pp. 98—100.

That Inspiration varied, both in degree and in the method of its operation, is manifest from several passages in the New Testament.\* There were 'diversities of gifts.' Some of them appear to have consisted simply in the inspiration of ideas, while others (the gift of tongues more especially) must have included a strictly verbal inspiration.† There can be no propriety, therefore, in maintaining that the whole of the Scriptures were written under the same kind of inspiration, or in confounding, as some theologians have done, inspiration and revelation. Mr. Haldane, in his *Treatise on Divine Revelation*, ventures to treat all such distinctions as theories, contending himself for the wildest of all theories, the absolute dictation by the Holy Spirit, of every word of both the Old and the New Testament. To him, Mr. Gurney's views would doubtless appear not less heretical than those of Michaelis, Doddridge, and Campbell, and we may add Beza and Luther. Inspiration must differ in kind according to the nature of that which is inspired, whether it be

\* Rom. xii. 6, &c. xiv. 2. 1 Cor. xii. 4, &c. Eph. iv. 7, &c.

† Of this kind of inspiration appears to have been the Divine aid promised by our Lord, Matt. x. 19, 20.



thoughts, words, or feelings; while revelation, properly so called, differs altogether from either kind of inspiration, inasmuch as it appears to have been for the most part communicated by angelic messengers, or by our Lord himself. Nor would the revelation have been the less true, had it been originally made to uninspired men, and transmitted to us in uninspired writings. Michaelis justly remarks, that 'if the Deity had not inspired a single book of the New Testament, but left the Apostles and Evangelists without any other aid than that of natural abilities to commit what they knew to writing, admitting their works to be authentic and credible, the Christian religion would still remain demonstrably the true one.'\* But, in the inspiration of the Prophets and the Apostles, we have a security that the Divine Revelation which they have transmitted to us, has not been mingled with any error or mistake. For instance, all that was requisite to render the Gospel of St. Matthew or St. John a faithful record, was, that the writer should accurately recollect what he had seen and heard; and there would have been no pretence for withholding from their narratives, even had they been uninspired men, the credit which is readily given to Tacitus, or Caesar, or Josephus. But as they might have fallen into mistake through defective recollection, it was specifically promised by our Lord, that the Holy Spirit should not only reveal to them 'things to come,' but 'bring all things to their remembrance whatsoever he had said unto them.' This miraculous gift of memory which ensured the accurate record of what was past, obviously differed from the miraculous discovery of future things; and both of these differed again from that miraculous knowledge of language by which the Apostles were qualified both to speak and write in various tongues. But for this, although the Evangelists had been accurate in their recollection, we should not have the security we now possess, that the Greek narrative uniformly conveys the true meaning and force of what our Lord delivered in the vernacular Syriac. With regard to the Apostolic historians, then, we seem to have what approaches to a verbal inspiration, since their use of language, not less than their recollection of our Lord's sayings and the facts connected with his ministry, was the result of a miraculous influence. The revelation contained in the writings of St. Paul was also in part a verbal communication from our Lord himself, as he distinctly intimates;† and for all the doctrines he inculcates, he claims the authority attaching to him as an apostle invested with miraculous credentials. We have

\* Vol. I. p. 72.

† Gal. i. 12. 1 Cor. ii. 13. 2 Cor. xii. 9.

moreover a distinct testimony to the inspiration of St. Paul's epistles, in the writings of another apostle, 2 Pet. iii. 16. Their inspiration can never be explained away, with any shew of reason or probability, into mere superintendence, much less into such a negative kind of intervention as Warburton contends for. It was direct or immediate, extraordinary, and miraculous. Of this, the gift of tongues was at once a sensible proof and a symbol. The incontestible fact, that the apostles, on the day of Pentecost, were suddenly inspired with the knowledge of so many vernacular dialects, is sufficient to establish not merely the possibility of a plenary inspiration of a prophetic nature, but to obviate every objection founded on the difficulty of explaining the mode in which it would operate. The external gifts of tongues and of healing were evidently designed as outward signs of that internal inspiration by which the Apostles were constituted 'the foundation of the Christian Temple, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone.'\*

The proof of the Inspiration of the books of the New Testament, then, appears to be as complete as could be desired. It follows necessarily upon the establishment of their authenticity and genuineness; and the same miraculous attestation which confirms the truth of the Christian doctrine itself, proves the inspiration and authority of the Apostles by whom it was promulgated. There can be no room for hesitation in designating the whole New Testament as the rule of faith, the word of Christ. There seems to us little occasion, then, to make use of any such argument from analogy as Mr. Gurney employs in the following paragraph.

'That the Old Testament was given by inspiration, we learn from the testimonies, whether more or less direct, of Jesus Christ and his apostles.

'That the New Testament was also of Divine origin, we may therefore conclude from analogy.

'This conclusion is confirmed by the positive evidence which the authentic narrative of the New Testament affords, that the Apostles who wrote the greater part of it were inspired; and that their inspiration was of a very exalted kind, we infer from the acknowledged fact that they wrought miracles.'

The analogical conclusion, we say, is at once weak and superfluous; the way, too, in which the argument is stated, has the appearance of reasoning in a circle. We know from the New Testament, says Mr. Gurney, that the Old Testament was given by inspiration; and we conclude from the inspiration of the Old Testament, that the New Testament also is inspired.

---

† 1 Cor. xiv. 22.



Had it been thus stated: We know from the declaration of our Lord and his Apostles, that the Old Testament Scriptures were inspired; and, as St. Peter classes the epistles of St. Paul with the Old Testament Scriptures, we conclude that they were inspired also,—the argument would have been legitimate; and in fact, Mr. Gurney has elsewhere availed himself of it. But the independent and positive evidence of the inspiration of the New Testament, both external and internal, is so satisfactory and complete, that all presumptive reasoning may safely be dispensed with. In justice to Mr. Gurney, we must remark, that the several arguments which he adduces in proof of the inspiration of the Apostles, are much more forcible, and his minor statements more decisive and unequivocal, than the language employed in his recapitulation would lead the reader to suppose. After pointing out the *internal* evidence supplied by the fulfilment of prophecy, by the discoveries which the Scriptures contain respecting the character of God, and by the unbroken spiritual harmony which prevails among the sacred writers, Mr. Gurney makes the following admirably just and practical remarks.

‘ It only remains for me to adduce, in evidence of the Divine origin of the Scriptures, the *practical effect which (under the influence of the Spirit) they actually produce*; namely, the conversion of sinners, and the sanctification and edification of believers. As these effects are to be attributed primarily to God as their Author, and secondarily to Christianity as the religious system which he has adapted to these ends, so are they found, in a multitude of instances, to arise immediately out of the use of that holy book in which Christianity is embodied. The Scriptures are able to make wise unto salvation, “through faith which is in Christ Jesus.” Such is the declaration of an apostle, and such is the fact. Now, the believer who experiences this effect to be produced in his mind, and is able to trace it to the Bible as the *instrumental cause*, enjoys an evidence that the Sacred Volume has proceeded from God, which is entirely satisfactory to himself, and of which the most ingenious arguments and cavils will never be able to dispossess him. He finds in that volume a mine of wisdom, from which he is constantly deriving instruction, consolation, and spiritual improvement. He resorts to it as to his daily food; he reverts again and again to the same passages without any wearisome sense of sameness, and seldom without deriving from them important practical lessons with which he was before less perfectly acquainted. Thus is he encouraged and strengthened to pursue his Christian course; and the more his knowledge of divine things and the limits of his own religious experience are extended, the more fully he is persuaded that the contents of Scripture are no cunningly devised fables, but celestial truths. *He finds in himself a witness of (to?) their reality.*

‘ It may indeed be observed, that the evidence of the Divine origin of Scripture, which the Christian derives from the source now men-

tioned, is, in some measure, confined to himself; because he obtains it chiefly by watching the condition and progress of his own mind. But this is not the case altogether; for the tree is known by its fruits. It is a matter of external observation, when the sinner is turned from the error of his ways, the proud man humbled, and the Christian character formed. It cannot be concealed from others, when the designed effect of an acquaintance with Scripture is actually produced in the individual; when "the man of God is perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." Nor can any one who entertains a just notion of the moral attributes of the Supreme Being, refuse under such circumstances to confess, that the writings from the use of which these consequences result, have originated in the power, the wisdom, and the love of God.' pp. 106—108.

It is no inconclusive evidence of their Divine origin, Mr. Gurney adds, that, in the Scriptures, 'we find both the *foundation* and the *boundaries* of all secondary means of religious improvement.'

'That the ministry of the Gospel ought to be exercised under the immediate direction of the great Head of the Church, is a principle which will probably be allowed by many pious Christians; yet we are not to forget, that when that ministry is most spiritual in its origin, it is still found to dwell on the declarations of Scripture. The purest gifts of the Spirit, as they are now administered, are almost exclusively directed to the application of those materials which originated in a higher and more plenary operation of the same Divine influence. Thus, also, the sentiments which chiefly edify in the writings of modern Christians, are precisely those sentiments which, in their original form, have been expressed by prophets and apostles. It is Divine truth, as applied to the heart of man by the Spirit of God, which converts, sanctifies, and edifies; and of this *Divine truth*, the only authorized record—a record at once original and complete—is the BIBLE.' pp. 108, 9.

If this be Quakerism, we are happy to assure Mr. Gurney, that, on this point at least, we are Friends. To a disregard of the Scriptural connexion between the operations of the Holy Spirit and the instrumental cause, that word which is Truth, almost every description of fanaticism owes its origin. The written Scriptures and the ministry of the word, separated from the agency of that Spirit which worketh all in all, are found to be alike powerless and inefficient; and those persons who ascribe an inherent efficiency to the instrument, or look for any spiritual effects independent of a Divine Agency, are chargeable with an infidel fanaticism not more reasonable than those who rely on immediate impressions, dreams, or inspirations, of which the revealed will and word of God are not the substance and the medium. On the other hand, a Popish regeneration,



a sacramental grace, which, while it seems to do honour to the Spirit of God, sets aside his word as the medium of his saving and sanctifying operations, attributing to water or a wafer the moral influence of truth, and substituting a sacerdotal incantation for the work of faith, Scripture and Reason alike disown. The office of the sacraments, we hold with Calvin to be 'precisely the same as that of the word of God, which is to offer and present Christ to us, and in him the treasures of his heavenly grace;' while, on our part, they serve at once as a solemn confession and pledge, a vow of allegiance and a significant memorial. On these grounds, and on that of their Divine appointment, we contend for the obligation of observing them.

If we have dwelt the longer on that portion of the volume which has given us the least satisfaction, it is in the hope that our suggestions may lead the estimable Author to reconsider the passages referred to. The sixth essay, which treats of the Divine nature and attributes, is a delightful specimen of genuine theology: the sentiments are strictly Scriptural, and a glow of piety is diffused over the whole, which is but too seldom preserved in theological treatises. In the subsequent essay, 'on the union and distinction in the Divine nature,' we have been not less charmed with the Author's explicit avowal and defence of the orthodox doctrine, and his correct method of stating it, which is in entire accordance with the views we expressed in a recent article. While the primary truth, that there is no other God than Jehovah, must ever be held sacred on the authority of the Holy Scriptures; 'it is on the same authority,' Mr. Gurney remarks, 'that we admit another doctrine,—namely, that in his revealed operations, and more especially in the appointment and application of the scheme of man's redemption, God has manifested himself to us as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.' The Divine nature of the Son of God is more fully discussed in the tenth Essay. In reference to the personality and deity of the Holy Spirit, after citing numerous declarations of Scripture, Mr. Gurney remarks:

'Now, if the inquiry be addressed to us, Who is this person of whom Christ and his apostles thus bear witness; who teaches and consoles the disciples of Jesus; who reproves the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgement; whom it is unpardonable to blaspheme, wicked and dangerous to tempt and to grieve; who finds his temple in the hearts of the righteous; who inspires the apostle, speaks by the prophet, appoints the overseer, calls forth, anoints, and directs the evangelist; who distributes to his people, according to his own will, those manifold gifts and graces by which the church is edified, and the cause of truth promoted?—the fundamental principles of our religion, and the whole analogy of Scripture, will assuredly admit but of one answer, This Person is God.'

' God is a Spirit. Invisible, and spiritual in his nature, he fills his own works : he exercises over them an unseen but powerful influence : he dwells and operates in the hearts of men. Nor can we deny the truth of the converse of such a proposition—namely, that the Spirit who fills the works of Deity, who exercises over them an unseen yet powerful influence, who dwells and operates in the hearts of men, is God. " Now, THE LORD IS THAT SPIRIT," said the Apostle Paul; " and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. But we all with open face beholding, as in a glass, the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as by THE SPIRIT OF THE LORD." ' pp. 147, 8.

Having briefly exhibited the Scriptural evidence that the Father is God, that the Son is God, that the Holy Spirit is God, Mr. Gurney proceeds to take a view of the additional passages in which ' the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, ' whose deity is thus distinctively and separately indicated, are ' presented to our attention as the united sources of the Christian's help and consolation, the united objects of the Christian's belief and obedience.' The first passage cited is John xvi. 13, 14., on which are founded the following forcible remarks.

' If, then, I am asked, who is to guide the people of God into all truth? I answer, on the authority of this luminous declaration, *The Spirit of Truth*. If I am asked again, Whose wisdom and grace does the Spirit of Truth administer? it is on the same authority that I reply, The wisdom and grace of the *Son of God*. And if, lastly, the inquiry be addressed to me, On what principle can we say that it is the wisdom and grace of the *Son*, which the Spirit administers? this inquiry also is fully met by the information contained in our text—namely, that all wisdom and grace are from the Father, and that whatsoever the Father hath, *is the Son's*. From whom then does the Christian derive the strength of his spiritual life and the hope of his soul's salvation? From the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. And to whom does he owe the tribute of gratitude and praise, and the return of a faithful and unhesitating obedience? To the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.' pp. 148, 9.

The other texts which Mr. Gurney proceeds to illustrate, are Eph. iv. 4—6; 1 Cor. xii. 4—6; 2 Cor. xiii. 14; Luke iii. 21, 22; and Matt. xxviii. 29, 30. In noticing the last of these, the Author slightly indicates his peculiar view of the rite, by remarking that ' in whatever manner we may here interpret the participle *baptizing*—whether we understand it as ' denoting merely the sign of conversion or the act of converting itself,'—the doctrine is clear, that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are in common the objects of the Christian's faith and allegiance. In the following paragraphs, Mr.



Gurney adverts to 'the order of that relation in which they stand to each other, and the distinct offices which they are respectively described as bearing in the glorious economy of the Divine dispensations.' This is ground, however, on which we fear to tread; and although we have no fault to find with Mr. Gurney's statements on the score of orthodoxy, since they are in strict accordance with the received opinions of theologians, yet, the stress laid on John xv. 26, as a proof of 'the subordination' of the Spirit to the Father and the Son,—that mysterious dogma of procession which has agitated contending churches,—we think far from judicious. On the whole, however, we have been highly gratified with this part of our Author's work, in which he has displayed not less wisdom than piety; and we cannot but anticipate the happiest results from the circulation of his clear and Scriptural statements.

The next essay, on the existence and personality of the Spiritual Adversary, is not less admirable. This subject has commonly been treated under the general head of the existence and attributes of angels, considered either as part of the works of God or as the agents of his government. The ministry of holy angels certainly claims a place among the articles of the Christian faith; but the character and agency of Satan as the author of evil, form a distinct topic, and one of such primary importance as to demand a separate consideration. In this point of view, systems of divinity are for the most part very defective; and Mr. Gurney will have rendered a great service to the Christian public, if, by his Scriptural and explicit manner of treating the subject, he should lead divines and preachers to give this topic its due place, not merely in their systems, but in their discourses. After reviewing the Scriptural evidence, Mr. Gurney expresses his astonishment, that any persons professing to regard the Scriptures as divinely inspired, and laying claim to the character of fair interpreters of the sacred volume, should deny the personality of the great adversary.

'It ought ever to be remembered, that the Holy Spirit can neither err nor *feign*; and although there is to be found in the Bible much of poetry, and something, perhaps, of allegory, yet, as a guide to practice and to doctrine, it can be regarded only as a code of principles and a record of realities. Besides, the descriptions of Satan are to be found principally in those parts of Scripture which are not poetical, but either historical or simply didactic. Never were there plainer or more unsophisticated historians—historians less disposed to indulge in fanciful imagery or oriental exaggeration—than Moses or the four evangelists, who have severally, in the course of their histories, presented to our attention the personal character and opera-

tions of Satan. To these are to be added, Paul, Peter, James, and Jude—those homely yet luminous didactic writers, who, as well as our blessed Lord himself, have all made mention of the devil, not as an allegorical figure, but as a powerful, insidious, malicious being.' p. 173.

The denial of the personality and power of Satan, Mr. Gurney very justly represents to be 'closely connected with a low and 'inadequate view of the malignity, the depth, and the danger 'of sin.' The essential demerit of sin is, in fact, a proposition which lies at the foundation of all theological science. In false views of this subject, the Pelagian, Socinian, and Antinomian heresies mainly originate; and unless this be admitted as a first principle clearly and necessarily deducible from the Perfection of God, it will be found impossible to give either meaning or coherency to any system having the least pretension to a Scriptural character. The fall of man is thus stated by Mr. Gurney in terms which appear to us alike clear and unexceptionable.

'The Scriptures teach us, that the fall of our first Parents from a condition of natural righteousness to one of natural sinfulness,—from a condition in which he was the heir of a blessing, to one in which he was the subject of the curse,—*was the immediate cause of a moral degeneracy, and therefore of a punishable guilt, in the whole family of his descendants.*' p. 209.

The practical observations with which this Essay closes, are highly striking and impressive, and serve as an excellent preparation for the subject of the ensuing essay, the character of the Saviour. Our limits will not admit of our pursuing any further an analysis of the work, but we must make room for a few more detached extracts. Mr. Gurney seizes every occasion to bear his decided testimony to the true and proper deity of the Son of God, his real equality and unity with the Father.

'The Father alone knoweth the Son, or who the Son is: the Son alone knoweth the Father, or who the Father is. The omniscient Father has a *perfect* knowledge of the Son; and the Son knoweth the Father, *even as* the Father knoweth the Son. The Son glorifieth the Father, and the Father glorifieth the Son. All those persons who are in a peculiar sense the Son's, are also the Father's; and all those persons who, in the same sense, belong to the Father, belong also to the Son. Whatsoever things, indeed, are possessed by the Son, are of necessity the Father's, and "all things that the Father hath," are the Son's. John xvi. 15. So intimate is their connexion—in so absolute a sense is it true that the Son is *in* the Father and the Father *in* the Son,—that whosoever believeth in the Son, believeth in the Father; whosoever knoweth the Son, knoweth the Father; whosoever seeth the Son, seeth the Father; to whomsoever the Son is shewn, the Father is shewn. So *even* is their fellowship in the



Divine nature, that the unity of mind and counsel which characterizes the *equal disciples* of the same Lord, is compared to the unity which subsists between *these two*—"That they may be one, as we are." John xvii. 11. Nothing, indeed, can be much more striking or more evidently unsuitable to the condition and circumstances of any mere creature, than the familiar use which, in speaking of himself and God the Father Almighty, our Lord has made of the pronouns, *we, us, our* "If a man love me," cried Jesus, "he will keep my words: And my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." John xiv. 23 This is a mode of speech with which (as it relates to Deity) nothing that I know of can be justly compared, but the phraseology adopted by Jehovah himself in the Old Testament: "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." Gen. i. 26. "Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil." iii. 22.'

The whole of the third part of this Essay, 'On Christ in his Reign,' will afford the pious reader the highest edification and delight. We have never read, speaking according to the best of our recollection, an argumentative defence of the divinity of our Lord, so calm, so dignified, so pure from controversial asperity, and at the same time so instinct and glowing with love to the Saviour. In the very spirit of the beloved disciple, the Author seems to dwell on the glories of the Lamb who is in the midst of the throne; and the rich accumulation of evidence, direct and indirect, promiscuously scattered throughout Scripture, which he brings to bear on the fundamental doctrine of the Christian faith, leaves on the mind an impression of triumphant satisfaction, answering to that noble confession with which Mr. Gurney closes the essay.

'For my own part, I may venture to acknowledge a firm conviction, (grounded on long continued study and reflection,) that I must either give up the inspiration of Scripture, and with it, perhaps, the truth of Christianity itself, or allow the absolute and eternal divinity of Jesus Christ. In choosing my alternative, I cannot for a moment hesitate; for as, on the one hand, the inspiration of Scripture and the truth of Christianity rest on a basis which the profoundest thought and widest investigation serve only to establish; so, on the other hand, the glorious doctrine of "God manifest in the flesh," although, *as to its mode*, mysterious, will ever be considered worthy of all acceptance, by those who are acquainted with the depth of their natural degradation, and know their need of an *omnipotent Redeemer*.'

We must hastily dismiss the eleventh essay, on Redemption, not as being of inferior interest, but because our limits will not admit of much further citation. It is divided into three sections: in the first, Mr. Gurney states with admirable clearness the Scripture doctrine of the Atonement; in the second, he treats of the merits and advocacy of Christ; in the third, 'of the

'Scripture doctrine of the Spirit,' he takes a view of our Lord's character as the 'internal illuminator' as well as 'spiritual quickener of mankind.' It is with peculiar satisfaction that we receive this able, lucid, and explicit exposition of the cardinal doctrine of justification by faith, from the member of a community among whom there has generally been understood to prevail very indistinct if not unscriptural notions on that subject. The only statement which we hesitate to approve occurs at page 455, where Mr. Gurney represents the sacrifice of our Lord 'as a price paid not only for the redemption of sinners, 'but for the outpouring of the Spirit.' We object to this language, first, because it confounds what Mr. Gurney has taken pains to distinguish,—the propiatory sacrifice of Christ, which was the price of our ransom or redemption, as being 'the means 'by which the Father saw fit to provide for the satisfaction of his justice' in the pardon of the sinner,—and, the merits and advocacy of Christ, of which the outpouring of the Spirit was the first fruits. But a second and more important objection is founded on the incorrect application which is here made of the metaphor of price or purchase, to the blessings of the Gospel. It is true, that he who ransoms a captive may be said to buy his liberty; and the party accepting of the ransom may be said to sell either the person or the freedom of his prisoner or slave for an equivalent. But the mercy of God is free and unpurchased; he receives no equivalent for the blessings he bestows. It is in the character of a Moral Governor only that he exacts or accepts a propiatory sacrifice, to declare his justice and his holiness; and in this reference, our Lord cannot be properly represented as paying a price, but as enduring a penalty. We are justified as criminals; we are redeemed as the captives of sin; we are constituted heirs of heaven as children of God's family. It is not heaven, but the Church itself that is the "purchased possession." It is not our pardon, but our souls that are bought with a price. The Scriptures employ these and other metaphors to describe, under different views, man's redemption; but we must guard against running one metaphor into another. Statements substantially true, but grossly improper in their phraseology, and very liable to misconception, have originated in the disregard of those limitations beyond which figurative language ceases to be either appropriate or true; and from a confusion of ideas on this point has resulted a metaphorical patchwork bearing little more resemblance to the language of the inspired writers, than the literal translation of idiomatic expressions does to the true force of the original.



In Mr. Gurney's views of regeneration, we fully coincide; and when he remarks that 'Divine grace is omnipotent,' he admits all that we are disposed on that point to contend for. We rejoice, too, to find him maintaining the unity of the Church.

'Christianity,' he remarks, 'is a social religion: its virtues are of a character at once binding and diffusive. And amidst all the fruits of the Spirit, there is none so delightful and so distinguishing as that holy love of which God in Christ is the first object, and all mankind the next, and which more especially unites in the bands of the fellowship of the Gospel those persons, of whatsoever name or profession, who believe in the Lord Jesus, and are baptized "*by one Spirit into one body*." Theirs is the "*unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace*"—"the communion of the Holy Ghost." And this communion extends itself from the church militant to the church triumphant. It already brings heaven and earth together, and its full perfection will be known in that glorious day when the number of God's elect shall be completed; (Matt. xxiv. 31; )—when all distinctions of peculiar opinion shall be for ever lost among them; and when the universal society of saints and angels shall unite in rendering unto the Lord God and the Lamb the same eternal tribute of obedience, thanksgiving, and praise.' p. 476.

Between those who believe that Jesus Christ is God, and those who regard him only as a creature, Mr. Gurney remarks, there is, plainly, an 'infinite difference,' one 'that admits of 'no compromise.' But,

'how numerous, how powerful,' he adds, 'are those doctrinal points in religion which are entertained in common by the great majority of the Christian world! One principal object which, in the laborious yet interesting task of composing the present volume, I have always kept in view, has been, to develop these *points of union*. I have desired to shew to my fellow-believers in the divinity of Jesus Christ—Roman Catholics as well as Protestants—Calvinists as well as Arminians—dissenters as well as members of the various established churches—the strength, the breadth, and the saving efficacy of those great features of Divine Truth in which they all agree. May this main agreement—an agreement which embraces every thing *absolutely essential* in religion—be more and more accompanied by gentleness, kindness, forbearance, and candour, and, above all, by the "*unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace*." Of this unity of the Spirit, founded as it is on an essential unity of doctrine, one principal result ought surely to be, our joint and common, or at least our *corresponding* and *harmonious* efforts to promote the salvation of the world.' p. 564.

We have passed over the twelfth essay, 'on faith and obedience,' and must not now return to it. We had marked several other passages for extract, but further citation cannot be

necessary, as few of our readers who place any confidence in our judgement, will hesitate to put themselves in possession of Mr. Gurney's volume. On contrasting these Essays with the Treatise on Christian Doctrine that lately came under our review, one cannot fail to be struck with the immeasurable superiority of the present Writer in true wisdom to our English Sophocles. Those words of holy writ have forcibly occurred to us: "The meek will He guide in judgement, the meek will He teach his way." There is a spirit pervading Mr. Gurney's volume, which leaves no room for doubt as to the influence under which it has been composed. But the contrast between the two works is more especially interesting as they may both be considered as reflecting in some measure the character and spirit of the times. That Quakerism has undergone some important modifications, on the one hand, since the time of Milton, Mr. Gurney will readily admit; and on the other hand, we feel persuaded that, had our great Poet lived at this era, he would never have put forth opinions so crude and erroneous. Nay, we cannot help imagining that an acquaintance with John Joseph Gurney, instead of the Quaker Ellwood, might not only have had a happy influence on Milton's religious tenets, but have led to the composition of a nobler poem than *Paradise Regained*.

---

Art. II. 1. *Lays of the Minnesingers or German Troubadours of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries*: illustrated by Specimens of the Contemporary Lyric Poetry of Provence and other Parts of Europe: with historical and critical Notices and Engravings from the MS. of the Minnesingers in the King's Library at Paris, and from other Sources. Small 8vo. pp. 328. Price 14s. London, 1825.

2. *The Songs of Greece*, from the Roman Text edited by M. C. Fauriel, with Additions. Translated into English Verse, by Charles Brinsley Sheridan. Small 8vo. pp. lxxii. 314. Price 13s. London, 1825.

**T**O the specimens of Russian, Batavian, and Spanish popular poetry with which Mr. Bowring has gratified the public, these two volumes may be considered as adding a German and a Greek Anthology,—bearing respectively very different dates, yet, in point of fact, referrible to a similar era in the progress of civilization. In Greece, in Russia, and in Spain, it is as yet but the thirteenth century. Those countries have overslept themselves half a dozen centuries, and they are but now beginning to awake to the light which dawned in the twelfth century, burst forth with morning brilliancy in the



sixteenth, and is now we trust, approaching nearer and nearer to a zenith from which it shall never decline.

The Minnesingers, or Love-singers of Germany, were contemporary with the most celebrated of the Troubadours. The most splendid era of early German poetry opens with the Suabian dynasty in the twelfth century. In Frederic Barbarossa, the most extraordinary man of his age, the infant literature found a zealous patron. His niece had married Raymond Berenger III. Count of Provence, and to his acquaintance with the Provençal poetry we must ascribe his literary taste. An epigram is extant, in the Provençal tongue, supposed to have been composed by this Imperial Mæcenas, which is curious as a commentary on the manners of the age.

‘ I like a cavalier Francés,  
And a donna Catalan;  
The good faith of the Genoese,  
And breeding Castillan;  
The Provence songs my ears to please,  
The dance of the Trevisan;  
The graceful form of the Aragonese,  
The speech of Sicily, (?) \*  
The hands and face of the Anglése,  
And a page of Tuscany.’

By some writers, this little piece has been ascribed to Frederic II., who was not less distinguished as the patron of literature. He was educated in Sicily, and was also a writer in the Provençal tongue. In Italy, where he almost constantly resided, he revived the academy of Salernum; he promoted the study of Grecian and Arabic learning, and his active exertions were directed towards imparting to his German subjects the benefit of the Southern schools. By the extinction of the Suabian dynasty towards the close of the thirteenth century, the school of the Minnesingers was deprived of that royal patronage to which it appears to have owed its existence and its celebrity; and the commencement of the fourteenth witnessed a total revolution in the literature of Germany. The church had regained its power over the public mind. The crusade against the Albigenses, by which Provence and Languedoc

---

\* We have ventured this as a conjectural emendation of the unintelligible line as given by the Editor, supposing *La Perla Julliana* to have been in the original, *La Parla Siciliana*. *La Cour de Kastellana* is rendered by the Editor, ‘Castilian dignity;’ we rather suppose it to mean courtesy or breeding, and that *onrar* is good faith. We have endeavoured, in our rude rhymes, to adhere more closely to the quaint form of the original.

were laid waste, had put to flight the Muses of Provence; and by the wars and disorders produced or fanned by sacerdotal ambition or monkish intolerance, Germany was again thrown back into barbarism.

‘It was not at the Imperial court only, however, that the taste for poetry was, in its day of prosperity, cultivated. “Germany, about the time of Frederic II., began,” as M. Schlegel observes, “to abound more than ever in petty princes; in sovereigns whose dominions were too insignificant to occupy the whole of their attention, and who, therefore, were at full leisure to think of procuring for their courts the ornaments of music, poetry, and the arts. These were the real patrons of German literature. It was thus that vast assemblages of minstrels and poets were collected around the courts of the Landgrave of Thuringia, and still more of the Austrian Babenbergs.” Suabia and German Switzerland seem to have been the principal sources whence the poetry of the Minnesingers flowed; but the same taste was more or less diffused all around, and there is every reason to believe that various other dialects were used by the Minnesingers, although nearly all that has come to us is Suabian. . . . . Accidental circumstances alone probably have deprived us of a great variety of early poetry, of the same character, in all the various Teutonic dialects. Even the Dutch was, according to Kinderling, very early cultivated as a poetic language; much earlier, indeed, than Mr. Bowring seems to have been aware. The court of Herman Landgrave of Thuringia was a principal focus of attraction for the literature of his age; and it is therefore improbable that the Suabian dialect should have been exclusively adopted. Similar patronage was bestowed at the Austrian, Bohemian, and other courts; and the names of the Emperor Henry and some others of the Imperial Family, of Count Frederic of Leiningen, Count Otho of Bottenloubé, Otho IV. Margrave of Brandenburg, Wenzel, King of Bohemia, Henry IV. Duke of Breslau, John, Duke of Brabant, &c. make the German catalogue of royal and noble poets, as distinguished as that of the Troubadours. The number of humbler minstrels is immense.’

pp. 104—8.

In like manner, the counts of Barcelona and monarchs of Aragon distinguished themselves as patrons of the Provençal bards; and modern times have afforded an illustrious instance of a similar spirit in the petty sovereign of Weimar. On comparing the lyric poetry of the Minnesingers with that of the Troubadours, the Editor thinks that the distinctive features of the Suabian minstrels appear in a more subdued and delicate tone of feeling: if less classical, they are more natural, less metaphysical, and more chaste, tender, and animated. Neither the *canzos* nor the *sirventes* of the Troubadours nor the *fabliaux* of the *Trouvères*, M. Sismondi remarks, can be read without a blush. The poetry of Germany is much less exceptionable in



this respect,—less Southern, or, may we say? less Oriental in its character. This fact is remarkable, and favours the opinion which we threw out in a recent article as to the superiority of the German tales in point of morality over the novelists of Southern Europe. Whatever national characteristics may distinguish the different schools of minstrelsy, they must all, however, be considered as having had a common and nearly simultaneous origin, resulting from that general impulse which appears to have been given to the progress of civilization and the development of mind among the newly settled European states towards the middle of the eleventh century. The earliest lyric poet of this era, William IX. Count of Poictou, was born in 1070, and died in 1126. The polished style and metrical symmetry of his compositions prove that the Provençal dialect was no longer a new or unformed language. Indeed, it appears to have acquired a distinct character so early as the eighth century. But the first rude efforts of the Provençal bards cannot be assigned to an earlier period than the middle of the tenth. The precise date, it is scarcely possible to fix; and it is important only as affording some clew to the circumstances under which they had their birth. Neither the capture of Toledo by Alfonso VI., nor the accession of Raymond Berenger to the earldom of Provence, will in itself account for the origin of the Provençal poetry. The opinion espoused by both Sismondi and Ginguené deduces its pedigree from the Arabians of Spain. But these writers, in common with most of those who contend for the Eastern origin of the minstrelsy and romance of the times of chivalry, confound the genealogy of fiction with the history of literature. When we have traced up a tradition or legend to its Arabian, Greek, or Scandinavian source, what have we done towards illustrating the causes which govern the development of genius? Little or nothing,—any more than the appearance of Dante is accounted for by the monkish legends of which he availed himself in his great poem, or than *Paradise Lost* is to be resolved into the dramatic mysteries of a preceding age. The theory which deduces the Provençal poetry from the Moors, is combated with considerable ingenuity by the present Editor. Father Andreu, who, in his work "*Dell' Origine e de Progressi d' ogni Letteratura*," first started the hypothesis, ventures to fix the very era when the gallant knights of Southern France became acquainted with the songs of the Moors, at the taking of Toledo in 1085.

‘Unfortunately,’ it is remarked, ‘M. Raynouard has published a Provençal poem anterior to 1000. Unfortunately, too, the Spaniards themselves, with whom these French knights fought, and whose lite-

ture, though at a much later period, has the most resemblance to that of the Moors, have nothing in the least approaching to the character of the Troubadour poetry till they imitated it in later ages; and moreover, the earliest school of Spanish poetry is that which bears least affinity to the Oriental.

‘It is almost vain to ask, upon what grounds this supposed derivation of the Provençal love-songs from the Arabs could rest. One would naturally be at a loss to think it probable, that a poetry founded on a devoted idolatry of woman and her absolute supremacy in the social system, should have sprung from a people whose principles lead to conclusions totally the reverse; or that those of the Christians who fled to mountain fastnesses, and only met their Moslem foes for deadly combat, should make them their masters in the fine arts. When, indeed, the Christians afterwards gained the ascendancy, the population might be expected to have imbibed much of the manners and perhaps the literature of their late masters. So, in fact, it turned out; but the character of this early Castilian literature is altogether different from that of the Troubadours. Both Moors and Spaniards must have considerably assimilated during so long a period of intermixture. For instance, the Arabs learned to raise their women to a rank in society approaching that which they enjoyed among the Christians,—though not to any great extent, for the allusions to the state of females in Conde’s compilations from the Arabian documents are strictly Oriental; and, on the other hand, their schools of mathematics, physics, and philosophy, were resorted to by the studious of all religious denominations. But it is perfectly absurd to attribute to them such an influence as is asserted over the poetic genius and social relations of distant European countries, at a time when the same principles were at work every where in giving the spring to civilization and the culture of the mental faculties. M. Ginguené will not even allow the smiling descriptions of the beauties of nature, the joyous revellings in the genial influences of spring, the delights of fields, of flowers, of brooks and groves, to be natural ornaments of poetic imagination:—“*tout cela est oriental.*”

‘What is the internal evidence on which the supposed derivation of Troubadour poetry from the Arabs rests? Father Andreu admits it to be true, that, in the compositions of the Provençals, there is no discernible vestige of Arabian erudition, nor any sign of their having formed themselves on the poetry of the Arabs. But he adds: “Neither does it appear that they were better acquainted with the works of the Greeks and Latins, nor have they made any use of the Grecian fables and of the ancient mythology.” His admission would probably be considered sufficient to destroy his theory; but, unluckily, this passage shews that Father Andreu, like many other writers on Provençal poetry, in reality knew very little of it, or he would be aware that it contains almost as many references to classical heroes and stories as to those of the romances of chivalry. References to the mythological tales of Ovid are frequent. On the other hand, there are scarcely any allusions to Arabian or Moorish language, customs, or feelings, throughout the whole body of pub-



lished Troubadour poetry, though there is scarcely another country of which the same can be said.

‘Between the Spanish-Arabian poetry and the later Castilian alone is there any great affinity; and nothing is more widely removed from the French Troubadour, than the Castilian school, till about the fifteenth century, when it began to be imitative.....The earliest efforts of the Castilian poets are of an epic cast, abounding chiefly in military adventure, and consisting for the most part of detached scenes of the exploits of the Cid and other warriors. This seems the genuine early national school of Castilian poetry. It has no feature in common with the Provençal or Catalan Troubadours, and scarcely any affinity to the Oriental schools. Next come the ballads of chivalry founded on the French romances, which are probably none of them older than the latter part of the fourteenth century. Soon after commenced the era of the later Spanish romances, pastoral ballads, &c. so justly admired, and of the Trobador or Amatory school of Spain, which is to a great extent merely imitative of the later efforts of the Provençaux and Italians. Last in date are the ballads of the proper Moorish school, which belong to the age when the Spanish power was finally overwhelming the Moorish dynasty and entering on the seats of their luxury and ease: of these it has been said with truth, they “live like echoes about the ruins of Moorish greatness.”’ pp. 37—45.

Yet, while we discard the notion of the Spanish-Arabian origin of the Provençal poetry and romance, we seem to have abundant evidence that they had their birth in that part of Spain, or rather Catalonia, and the adjacent provinces of France, bordering on the Mediterranean. The present Writer remarks, that, from the earliest days of Provençal glory, its court had enjoyed the most intimate union with that of Barcelona; and on the accession of Count Alfonso II. to the throne of Aragon, the ‘empire of love and poetry’ became extended over a considerable proportion of the western part of the peninsula. The Catalan is a genuine Romance tongue, more ancient than the Castilian, and bearing the closest affinity to the Limousin. Notwithstanding that the Provençal was used at the court, and many of the Spanish poets wrote in it, the Catalan Troubadours are represented to have been numerous, though few of their compositions have come down to us. But Provence appears to have been the nursery of the infant literature.

‘The gay, smiling climate of the South of France,’ remarks the present Writer, ‘seemed to combine with the superiority and freedom of its political institutions to call forth the earliest fruits of chivalry and its attendant song. “In the middle age,” says Papon, in his General History of Provence, “there were more free persons in Provence than in any other province; and the revolutions in the

monarchy having made themselves much less sensibly felt there, our towns were able to maintain their municipal administration. If the calamities of the times occasioned any interruption, they recovered themselves without any intervention on the part of the sovereign. As early as the beginning of the twelfth century, they were in possession of a form of government bearing a resemblance to that which had been given them by the Romans." During the greater part of the tenth century, while Northern France was a prey to intestine commotions, Provence and part of Burgundy and its dependencies had enjoyed repose under the mild rule of Conrad the Pacific. Perhaps we may even look higher up, and trace the superior cultivation of some of the Southern states to the influence of the laws of the Burgundians, which certainly formed the most equitable and mild of the codes established on the basis of Roman jurisprudence. The courts of the Berengers, the sovereigns of Catalonia and part of Southern France, became the principal nurseries of the opening talent, and the centre of union with other European nations. The period of their power embraces the whole bloom of Provençal literature, and their patronage of it every where stimulated the foreign courts with which they were connected to the cultivation of similar pursuits.' pp. 15, 16.

We thus seem to have established a close connexion between the first dawn of European literature and the existence of civil freedom and equal laws; and we must not forget, in this reference, that the birth-place of the Provençal Muses was the country of the Albigenses. 'The poets,' we are told, 'were no friends to the Church of Rome,'—opposed to it alike through the love of letters and the love of liberty.

'Many of the last efforts of Troubadour song were exerted in vindicating the rights of humanity against the cruelty and corruption of Rome and its retainers; and it is singular also, that some of the earliest remains of the poetry of this dialect, collected by M. Raynouard, are those of the heretic Vaudois or Waldenses.'

But how came these countries to be the first to receive the light of the morning which succeeded to the palpable night of Gothic barbarism? It has been usual to rank the Arabian settlements in Europe and the Crusades among the chief causes of the revival of learning. With regard to the latter, we endeavoured to shew, in our review of Mr. Mills's History of the Crusades\*, that the hypothesis which ascribes a beneficial influence to those fanatical and savage expeditions, though sanctioned by some respectable writers, is altogether unfounded and erroneous; and that Gibbon has more justly appreciated their true character and consequences when he remarks, that

---

\* Eclectic Review, Vol. XIII. p. 519, &c.



they 'checked, rather than forwarded, the maturity of Europe.' Mr. Berington's opinion, we apprehend, does not overstep the truth; namely, that they were 'utterly sterile with respect to 'the arts, to learning, and every moral advantage.' The representations of Warburton and Warton, that the holy wars were the means of introducing into the west, new and inexhaustible materials for poetry and romance, have been disproved by Ritson and Dunlop; and Mr. Mills has shewn that the opinion espoused by Mezerai, who is for deriving romance from the Crusades, is not only gratuitous, but involves an anachronism. The council of Clermont, by which the first crusade was decreed, was not held till November 1095; Jerusalem was not taken till 1099; long before which time that impulse had been communicated to society, of which the progress of the Albigenses and the rise of the Troubadours or Provençal school were the results. The earliest Provençal poem known to be extant, dates, we have seen, anterior to the year 1000; and the opinions of Berengarius had already spread very widely in Italy, Germany, France, and England, when the council of Tours was summoned in 1055. In thus connecting circumstances having apparently so little relation to each other as the spread of certain religious opinions and the formation of a poetical school and language, we shall not be understood as intimating that the heresy (so deemed) and the literature of the gay court of Provence had any affinity either in their character or as cause and effect; but we view them respectively as indications of that rising spirit of civil and religious freedom, which the Inquisition and the Crusade against the Albigenses were set on foot by the Holy Alliance of those days to extinguish. The question now before us is, How came Provence to be distinguished as the land of liberal institutions, the nursery of freedom and letters?

'Massieu,' remarks the present Writer, 'imports the Arabic poetry, with Warton's fiction, by sea at Toulon and Marseilles; for he tells us, that, by the convenience of these ports, it passed with the commerce between Spain and France.' This importation of Arabian poetry, we have seen, is a mere reverie of the learned writer's. But Warton appears to us to have unconsciously approximated the true solution of the question, when he fixes on commerce as the real source of that influx, not of poetry and romance indeed, but of liberal ideas, productive industry, and wealth, to which the revival of learning must be ascribed. The shores of the Mediterranean still commanded and concentrated at that time the commerce of the world; and in the wake of commerce, Christianity, freedom, literature, and the arts, have uniformly followed. The

Italian republics derived their riches and their greatness from the commerce of the Levant; and to the same cause the maritime capitals of Provence and Catalonia owed their commercial and political greatness. Barcelona was recovered from the Moors by Louis the Debonair early in the ninth century. For seventy years after, it was governed by French viceroys; till at length, in 874, it was acknowledged as an independent earldom. From the earliest times, there appears to have been a close connexion between the Catalonian capital and Marseilles. In the former city, great numbers of Jews are said to have found shelter, bringing with them their well known habits of mercantile enterprise. Refugees and adventurers of all nations would naturally be attracted to those free and populous cities, which held out at once religious toleration and encouragement to industry. The effect of commerce upon internal trade and manufactures needs not be pointed out. The manufactures of Barcelona were famous in the thirteenth century, and are probably more ancient, while those of Marseilles were equally, if not more considerable. It is remarkable, that the *Cathari* or Puritans, who began to attract attention early in the twelfth century, and whom there is good reason to identify with the Albigenses and Vaudois, are said to have been called in France *Tisserands*, Weavers, because numbers of them were of that occupation;—a singular coincidence, that the Protestants, the Hugonots of that day, should be distinguished by a name that recalls the origin of our own silk-manufactures, for which we are indebted to the edict of Nantz! It is not, therefore, a mere hypothesis, but an historical fact, that the first buddings of literature after the dreary winter of the dark ages, the first kindlings of intellectual and moral life, took place in the immediate neighbourhood of those great maritime cities which furnished at once a vent and mart for the productions of industry, and an inlet to knowledge as well as to wealth and every humanizing influence.

The reciprocal connexion between productive industry, mercantile wealth, and civil and religious freedom, their active and re-active operation, and their influence in extending every species of useful knowledge, are illustrated by the whole course of modern history. Why then need we look any further for a solution of the problem which has so long employed the speculations of learned writers, respecting the revival of learning? To the Arabians and to the Christian monks, literature is deeply indebted for the preservation and transmission of the stores of Greek learning; but it would not be more absurd to ascribe its revival to the institution of monasteries, than to the Moorish conquest of Spain. And as litera-



ture and civil liberty seemed to spring up at the same time, so they declined, and for the time appeared to perish together. The once brilliant school, and even the language of the South of France were consigned to oblivion by the bloody wars against the Albigenses; and the southern provinces, stripped of their independence, were one by one annexed to the crown of France. The rising courts of Naples and Sicily became the resort of the votaries of the gay science, and the dialect of the Norman princes superseded that of Toulouse and Provence. In Germany, the iron reign of ecclesiastical power had the same blighting influence on the nascent literature. In Spain, the joint despotism of the monarchy and the Inquisition was established on the ruins of all that had formed the national greatness. In that ill-fated country, the experiment of intolerance has been fully tried, and the genuine effects of unmitigated Popery have been unequivocally displayed. Learning, commerce, manufactures, population, every thing has declined. The expulsion of the Moors, a measure as impolitic as it was iniquitous, gave a shock to the political system from which it has never recovered. A population of twenty millions was, within two centuries, reduced by misgovernment to less than a third of that number.\* And the present frightful condition of this fine country presents an awful instance of that retributive justice, with which, even in this world, nations and communities are visited. The blood of the martyrs of the sixteenth century, the victims of the Inquisition, still cries out to heaven; and though that engine of priestly fury no longer exists, the infernal spells are not yet reversed, by which the execrable Dominick succeeded in enthraling the devoted nation.

From this revolting picture, it is pleasing to turn to the songs of emancipated Greece. And here, again, we may trace the same connexion between the stimulus supplied by commerce and the first movements of liberty, that we have pointed out in the case of the Italian Republics and the Provençal and Catalonian states, to which might have been added Holland, the Hanseatic republics, and England herself. Towards the latter end of the eighteenth century, Marseilles almost monopolized the commerce of the Levant. France was the only power in favour with the Divan; her consuls maintained throughout the dominions of the Porte

---

\* At the close of the fourteenth century, the population of Spain is stated by several native writers to have amounted to nearly two and twenty millions. In 1688, it did not amount to twelve, and under Philip V. it had sunk to six millions.

her commercial ascendancy; and the French language was, in Turkey, in Syria, and in Greece, the only medium of commercial intercourse. Since Malta has been in our possession, the sovereignty and guardianship of the Mediterranean have been virtually in the hands of Great Britain. Italian vessels are now no longer deterred from keeping the sea through fear of the Barbary corsairs. But the Greeks more especially have, from being mere pirates, become active merchants, and bid fair to share with England the commerce of the Levant. For several years before the present insurrection broke out, between four and five hundred Greek ships were employed in the commerce of the Black Sea; and a great part of the internal maritime trade of Turkey was in their hands. It is remarkable, too, that the formation of colleges and the revival of learning in Greece have kept pace with the increase of their commerce; and the same causes are bringing on, in the nineteenth century, the regeneration of society at the eastern extremity of Europe, which were instrumental in rolling away the Gothic darkness from the western nations.

But we must hasten to give some account of the volumes which have suggested this train of remarks. The extracts which we have given from the preliminary dissertation prefixed to the *Lays of the Minnesingers*, will have shewn the taste and ability with which the critical department is executed. The volume is a joint production, the translations being by another hand. The first specimen is an ode on the merry month of May by Count Conrad of Kirchberg, who sang in the latter part of the twelfth century. It begins thus:

‘ May, sweet May, again is come,  
May that frees the land with gloom;  
Children, children, up and see  
All her stores of jollity!  
On the laughing hedgerow’s side  
She hath spread her treasures wide;  
She is in the green-wood shade,  
Where the nightingale hath made  
Every branch and every tree  
Ring with her sweet melody.  
Hill and dale are May’s own treasure  
Youths rejoice! In sportive measures  
Sing ye, join the chorus gay!  
Hail this merry, merry May,’ &c.

This, it must be admitted, is simple and natural enough, but the namby-pamby versification does not strike us as doing justice to the original. The following is a ‘mood of my own



'mind,' which, in its style of sentiment, reminds us of Wordsworth.

' 'Twas summer,—through the opening grass  
The joyous flowers upsprang,  
The birds in all their different tribes  
Loud in the woodlands sang ;  
Then forth I went, and wander'd far  
The wide green meadow o'er ;  
Where cool and clear the fountain play'd,  
There stray'd I in that hour.

' Roaming on, the nightingale  
Sang sweetly in my ear ;  
And by the greenwood's shady side,  
A dream came to me there ;  
Fast by the fountain, where bright flowers  
Of sparkling hue we see,  
Close shelter'd from the summer heat,  
That vision came to me.

' All care was banish'd, and repose  
Came o'er my wearied breast ;  
And kingdoms seem'd to wait on me,  
For I was with the blest.

' Yet, while it seem'd as if away  
My spirit soar'd on high,  
And in the boundless joys of heaven  
Was wrapt in ecstasy,  
E'en then, my body revel'd still  
In earth's festivity ;  
And surely never was a dream  
So sweet as this to me.

' Thus I dream'd on, and might have dwelt  
Still on that rapturous dream,  
When hark ! a raven's luckless note  
(Sooth, 'twas a direful scream,)  
Broke up the vision of delight ;  
Instant my joy was past :  
O, had a stone but met my hand,  
That hour had been his last.'

A fragment by the same minstrel, Walter Vogelweide, describes in a very natural and pathetic manner, the feelings with which he revisited the scenes of his youth on his return from the holy land.

' Ah ! where are hours departed fled ?  
Is life a dream, or true indeed ?  
Did all my heart hath fashioned  
From fancy's visitings proceed ?

Yes! I have slept; and now unknown  
 To me the things best known before:  
 The land, the people, once mine own,  
 Where are they?—they are here no more.  
 My boyhood's friends, all aged, worn,  
 Despoil'd the woods, the fields, of home,  
 Only the stream flows on forlorn!  
 (Alas! that e'er such change should come!)

And he who knew me once so well,  
 Salutes me now as one estranged:  
 The very earth to me can tell  
 Of nought but things perverted, changed:  
 And when I muse on other days,  
 That pass'd me as the dashing oars  
 The surface of the ocean raise,  
 Ceaseless my heart its fate deplores. &c.'

Among the poems of Troubadours, those of Bernard de Born, who flourished in the latter part of the twelfth century, are distinguished by their spirit and marked character. The one beginning, 'The beautiful spring delights me well,' breathes a curious mixture of gayety and martial ardour; and the preceding one is singularly elegant for the times. Our readers will, however, be better pleased with the modest merit of the following simple stanzas by a Gascon knight, Gaubert Amiels.

- ' I covet not a high-born dame;  
 An equal in degree  
 Is all I seek; for wealth and fame  
 Heaven never meant for me.  
 I wish not for the joys that reign  
 Mid courtiers great and high;  
 For were I sure success to gain,  
 It would not bring me joy.
- ' I ever loved the single bird  
 That sings beside my bower,  
 More than the noisy songsters heard  
 At distance, hovering o'er;  
 Nor would I seek the lady's grace  
 Who seeketh not for mine,  
 Like that poor swain who left his place  
 For regal dame to pine.
- ' For lofty aims I do not care,—  
 To courtiers leave them free:  
 But there is ONE, whose chain I wear,  
 For she has vanquish'd me:  
 From Paris e'en to the Garonne,  
 There is not one so fair,  
 Nor, noble though they be, not one  
 Who thus my love can share.



‘ To her, then, will I grateful bow,  
 And willing thanks repay  
 For kind and courteous acts, that show  
 More fair each coming day.  
 Nor shall it cost a single sigh  
 That *higher* dames there be ;  
 Since few indeed can rank *so high*,—  
 So fair, so bright as she.

‘ Thus equal, not too high or low,  
 Happy I love : and, loving, know  
 How blest I am :—more blest by far  
 Than if my love more lofty were.’

The false rhyme in the last couplet sadly mars the conclusion ; but we have too frequent reason to complain of the negligence or indolence of the Translator in this respect. Fidelity with as close an adherence as possible to the rhythm of the original, appears to have been the chief object with the Poetical Co-editor ; and in these respects, the translations have considerable merit. In compositions of this character, however, where the whole beauty lies in the turn of expression and the music of language, literal fidelity is preserved at too high a cost, if it require a departure from correct versification, and a disregard of the peculiar genius of the English language. These translations strike us as more clever than poetical, more ingenious than graceful, displaying more facility and tact than delicacy of taste. We give as our last specimen, some very pleasing lines, in which Conrad of Wurtzburg, who flourished towards the close of the thirteenth century, laments over the declining popularity of his art, in the true spirit of a genuine bard.

‘ Unwilling stays the throng  
 To hear the minstrel’s song ;  
 Yet cease I not to sing,  
 Though small the praise it bring ;  
 Even if on desert waste  
 My lonely lot were cast,  
 Unto my harp, the same,  
 My numbers would I frame.  
 Though never ear were found  
 To hear the lonely sound,  
 Still should it echo round ;  
 As the lone nightingale  
 Her tuneful strain sings on  
 To her sweet self alone,  
 Whiling away the hour  
 Deep in her leafy bow’r,

Where night by night she loves  
Her music to prolong,  
And makes the hills and groves  
Re-echo to her song.'

The Songs of Greece are offered by the Translator, 'not as mere rhymes, but as documents proving the heroism and illustrating the manners of Greece.' They consist of, 1. Historical Ballads, describing the adventures of *Kleftai* or events of pathetic interest, and not unfrequently reminding the reader of the Spanish ballads relating to the conflicts between the Christians and the Moors, or the minstrelsy of our own border; 2. Romantic Ballads; 3. Domestic Songs; 4. Distichs current on the coast and islands. To these are added some 'recent odes of Greek literati.' The following simple ballad celebrates the heroism of a Thessalian *Armatolé* who lived some thirty or forty years ago.

'I see the Turks in every pass,  
Th' Arnauts on many a hill;  
Yet Sterghios, while his breath remains,  
Will brave the tyrant still.

'While snow descends on mountain heights,  
Submit not to the Turk:  
No! rather let us make our lair  
Where wolves are forced to lurk.

'While slaves beneath the splendid weight  
Of Plenty's gilded chains,  
Enjoy with infidels below  
Their cities and their plains;

'The brave have here a citadel  
In every lonely glen:  
Rather than share with Turks the mosque,  
We share with beasts the den.'

There are several ballads on the fall of Suli, the history of which most interesting episode in the Greek Revolution we gave in a former volume.\* We select one which records by no means a solitary instance of female heroism, recalling the days of Carthage and Numantia.

' DESPO.

'Loud shouts are echoing through the rocks,  
While muskets ring and thunder.  
Is it to strike some bridal crowd  
With joy and childish wonder?

---

\* Ecl. Review, vol. xiv. p. 534, &c.



- ‘ ’Tis Despo who is combating  
With many a dark-eyed daughter :—  
Within Dimoula’s tower she stems  
Th’ Albanian tide of slaughter.
- ‘ “ Despo, submit, for Suli lies  
Shatter’d and black with ruin ;  
Then trust Ali, who ne’er unmoved  
Can gaze on Beauty suing.”
- ‘ “ Since Suli and Kiapha crouch,  
I bar this gate the faster :  
Nor Despo nor her daughters e’er  
Receive a Moslem master !”
- ‘ She seiz’d a torch—uneearthly came  
Her dying voice, and hollow :  
“ We never must be slaves to Turks—  
I fly ! my children, follow !”
- ‘ ’Mid cartridges she plunged the torch,  
And all was bursting fire :  
That mother and those lovely girls  
Have join’d their murdered sire !’

The inscription on the sabre of Kontoghianni is strikingly characteristic :—

- ‘ Let him who courts not kings, but death,  
Who loves the free, and leads the brave,  
Whose only life is honour’s breath,  
Possess in trust this Grecian glaive.’

The following is a fragment highly interesting as indicating the spirit which, we are assured, even children have displayed since the commencement of the contest. Fingari (properly Phengari, from *Φαίγγος*) is the bonny Lady Moon, better known to English readers under the name of Cynthia.

- ‘ Mayst thou still be pure and bright,  
Journeying through th’ expanse of night,  
If, Fingari, thou wilt tell,  
(Call’d without a sorcerer’s spell,)  
What Grevena’s children, tried  
By the tempter’s power, replied.
- ‘ They repose in early graves,  
But they long were youthful slaves.  
Then a cruel Turkish dame,  
Wielding hope, and fear, and shame,  
Nightly chains and daily blows,  
Tempted them to end their woes :—

"Will ye each become a Turk,  
Never knowing want or work?  
Then ye will have Arab steeds,  
Damask blades and costly weeds."

"Turkish lady! wilt thou be  
Christian, poor, and meek as we?  
Thou wilt have the Holy Book,  
That which makes us upward look,  
From an earthly tyrant's rod,  
To the blessed throne of God."

The notes to the translations, so far as they are explanatory of the text, are highly acceptable; but they too often run out into flippancy. We were startled at the assertion in one of them, 'that female modesty exists in Greece to a greater degree than in any country on earth.' The most candid way of accounting for this remark, coming from an Englishman, is by supposing that his acquaintance with our own countrywomen has been confined to high life. Our Author is compelled to own, however, that one of the songs (it is not the only one of the kind) 'does not justify the praises elsewhere bestowed upon the *retenue* of the Greek ladies;' and he then proceeds to lay the blame of their 'forwardness' on the climate. This immoral apology, which, by assigning a general cause, would seem to admit that the effect is general also, might as well have been given in the words of a line with which Mr. Sheridan must be familiar,—

'The stars are more in fault than they.'

We deem it necessary, however, to state, that that English modesty which, in spite of Thomas Little and Don Juan, we believe not to be extinct, will resent some of the specimens of Greek modesty in these popular songs. Among those of a domestic cast are a few specimens of Greek lullabies. One of them begins with the following invocation:

'Santa Maria! cover the child!  
Santa Sophia! sing him asleep!'

In the second stanza occurs a vulgarism, 'the devil to pay,' for which, not having M. Fauriel's text at hand, we know not how far the Greek is responsible. Another lullaby we give entire.

'Hush! hush! my sleeping babe!  
And thou shalt have in a trice,  
Alexandria for thy sugar,  
And Cairo for thy rice;



' The great Constantinople  
For three long years of pleasure ;  
Three Asiatic cities,  
To fill thy chest with treasure ;  
' Three provinces around  
Their tribute duly bringing ;  
Three mountain monasteries  
With three tall belfries ringing.'

We can spare room for only one more extract, and we shall take a ballad descriptive of a naval engagement, supposed to be written about a century ago.

' A ship as black as night  
Towards Cassandra flew,  
With dark o'er-shadowing sails,  
And banner heavenly blue.

' A Brig with blood-red flag,  
To meet her ploughs the brine ;—  
" Lower that flag," she cries,  
And back those sails of thine !"

" " We strike nor flag nor sail !"  
Replied the dauntless Chace ;

" Our Brig is not a maid  
Who fears the battle's face"—

" " Like Ocean's bride she bears  
Brave Boucovalla's son ;—  
Leventis ! hard a port !  
And let your braces run !

" " The blood of yonder Turks  
Must tinge the waves below !"  
The Brig bore bravely up,  
And near'd her sable foe.

' They touch—the Grecians board—  
With Stathas at their head.  
Carnage has choked the deck,  
And Ocean's self is red !

' That bloody flag is down !  
That turban'd host are slaves !  
Hellas has smote the Turk  
Upon her native waves !'

Of the fidelity of these translations we have not the means of judging. The versification, it will be seen, is loose, but spirited, and for ballads, perhaps, sufficiently correct. The Author speaks of his performance in terms that must disarm the severity of criticism. ' The Author of Hohenlinden trans-

'lating the songs of peasants,' he says, 'would have been a 'blood-horse harnessed to a cart;' but, as for himself, he is ready, if ordered by his friends of the Greek Committee, to lower his literary efforts 'even to chalking up Greece for ever.' We fear that this would not answer so well for the object proposed, as chalking up 'Buy Warren's blacking' in the streets of Rome. The Greek Committee will, we hope, find Mr. Sheridan better employment; and as for the Author of *Hohenlinden* and of *Theodoric*, he knows better than to deem it a degrading task to translate some of these songs of peasants into living verse, and he might be worse occupied. The profits of this volume are to be given to the Society for the promotion of Education in Greece.

---

Art. III. *The Life of the Rev. Philip Henry, A.M.* With Funeral Sermons for Mr. and Mrs. Henry, by the Rev. Matthew Henry, V. D. M. Corrected and enlarged by J. B. Williams, F. S. A. 8vo. pp. xlviii. 488. Price 15s. London, 1825.

WE should hope that we have few readers to whom it can be necessary to recommend one of the most valuable pieces of biography extant; the life of Philip Henry, written by his Son, the Author of the well known Exposition of the Bible. To say that every Protestant Dissenter ought to have it in his library, would be to under-rate the character of Henry and the merits of the work. Like Archbishop Leighton and Bernard Gilpin, Howe, and Doddridge, Philip Henry belongs less to the communion of which he was a member, than to the Church Catholic; and although if Dissent needed defence in the present day, the lives of such men would furnish its best apologies, yet, the charm of their biography is, that it elevates the reader into a holy atmosphere where the noisy contentions of sect and party are no longer audible. Dr. Wordsworth has done himself honour, and his readers a service, by inserting the life of Philip Henry in his *Ecclesiastical Biography*, remarking, that 'if he could any where have found nonconformity united 'with more Christian graces,' than in his character, the example should have found a place in his volumes. All parties, in fact, have concurred in so warmly eulogizing both the subject and the author of the memoir, that it is both the reader's fault and his loss, if he has hitherto remained unacquainted with it.

The curious and indefatigable pains bestowed by the Editor of this edition in the shape of annotations, additions, twenty-eight appendices, and a corps de reserve of notes, may be compared to what is called by print-collectors *illustrating a*



volume; but in this instance, it is not the copy, but the whole edition which is illustrated; literally so, in the first place, by two original portraits, one of Philip Henry, and the other of Mrs. Henry: the latter has never before been engraved. The memoir itself has been carefully compared with the original in Matthew Henry's hand-writing. The additions consist chiefly of letters and other extracts from the unpublished papers of the Henry family in the Editor's possession. For their bulk, the following apology is offered:—

‘Objections may arise to such large additions to the original volume; and it may be feared, that the Editor, through partiality, or for other reasons, has been led to introduce passages too unimportant for publicity. He hopes, however, to stand acquitted at all events, by those who regard his *end*, and that, on perusal, the book will display somewhat of watchful caution for the avoidance of such an error. He does not expect, indeed, that *all* will approve either the plan adopted or the selections furnished. It would be difficult, perhaps impossible, to arrange or extract from a mass of theological effusions like Mr. Henry's, so as to give universal satisfaction. Nothing is made public, it is hoped, which can justly be deemed offensive to a discriminating judgement, inconsistent with a due regard to the venerated writer, or prejudicial to the interests of that charity for which he was so deservedly famed.’

Except as augmenting the price of the volume, few readers, we apprehend, will be inclined to object to any of the additions from Mr. Henry's papers, nor can their contents stand in need of any apology. And even with regard to the other additions, the reader will feel too much obliged to the Editor's literary diligence, and be too favourably impressed with his biographical enthusiasm, to quarrel with those which he may deem trifling or superfluous. The immense number of the Editor's references, and the multifarious reading which they indicate, form certainly a striking and somewhat curious feature of the volume. We have not for a long time been accustomed to see such authors as Caryl on Job, Baxter, Nicholas Udall, Hooker, Lord Bacon, Locke, Morning Exercises, Clarke's Lives, Nonconformist's Memorial, Fuller, Gurnall, Goodwin, and other worthies of olden time, laid under contribution and cited at the foot of the page as familiar acquaintance. If these notes are not always illustrative or useful,—as, for instance, when they consist of bare references to some book in which the Editor has found a sentiment accordant with his own, (see pp. x. xx. xxvi. xxvii.) or when Plutarch and Cæsar are subpoenaed as evidence of the age of Alexander at the time he had conquered the world,—still these take but little room; and they shew both with what minute labour the work has

been compiled, and how legally precise is the correctness which the Editor has been solicitous to observe. In fact, if sometimes the antiquary appears, and sometimes the influence of a professional regard to precision,—the most conspicuous feature in Mr. Williams's part of the work, is a spirit of piety, together with an enthusiasm which does him honour, in regard both to his subject and the divines of other days. There is much good sense and justice in the following observations.

‘ It cannot escape remark, that those associations with eternity which, by a moral necessity, attend written lives, gain, in a case like the present, special ascendancy: they seize the mind with a firm grasp, and, if duly cherished, disentangle it from the world. Having traced the earthly sojournings of the heaven-bound traveller, and impressed the increasing development of principles as unvarying as they are immortal, every advance towards the “final hour” occasions new and refined excitements. At length placed in imagination upon the brink of that river which “has no bridge,” we gaze upon the pilgrim as he draws nigh to the water, and listen to his parting salutation; as the billows rise and swell around him, every thing irrelevant and unhallowed is absorbed in personal interest; the “reign of stillness” commences, and other cares and other thoughts, save those of future and interminable existence, are silenced and suppressed.’

In all that Mr. Williams says on the subject of the value of religious biography, we fully concur; and his caution is judicious: ‘Let the eye be intently fixed upon high examples, and not upon those who rank at best only as inferiors in the ‘school of Christ.’ There is no lack of religious memoirs and obituaries in the present day; but these have too often a tendency to depress and obscure the standard of Christian excellence, rather than to excite a holy emulation. These tributes of friendship, memoirs, remains, and diaries, may, we admit, awaken serious thoughts in the young; may have a softening influence on the heart, exciting sentiments of a pensive and religious character; and sometimes they may console the reader by the faithful disclosure of kindred infirmities. Of the most feeble performance of this description, positive error being excluded, who would venture to say, that it could do no good? Still, it will not be maintained that these pensive or consolatory sentiments are of that high order which it is the proper end of religious biography to produce. There is always, it is to be hoped, existing among us, a staple Christianity of a quality not inferior to these specimens, in the lives and characters of some at least of the men with whom we are surrounded; affording the basis of Christian friendship and the cement of all improving intercourse. There are many individuals who, had they died at one and twenty, would have furnished matter



for most interesting remains, and whose living examples would weigh against many an octavo volume, but who, perhaps, will live so long as to escape from biography, which of late has only embalmed the remains of the young, and to forestal this sort of posthumous reputation. Still, the present is not, we fear, the age of heroic models; or if it be, the medium of the times we live in is not favourable to our seeing them in that impressive light in which the saints of other days stand out to our imitation. If there be any optical illusion in the forms and colours which the distant objects of biography present, it is a beneficial one. Of this, any one may, we think, convince himself, who will compare the impression produced by the perusal of such lives, with that which is excited by the best specimens of modern biography. When we contemplate real excellence, the imagination becomes the friend of virtue; and the imagination is always most excited by that which is venerable with antiquity or shadowy with distance. Let us hope that posterity may derive many of its models from the present age; but we must take ours from the days of our fathers. On this subject, we cannot do better than transcribe the sentiments of two eminent men, as given by Mr. Williams in the form of notes.

“It doth us good to read and hear such true, holy, and approved histories, monuments, orations, epistles, and letters, as do set forth unto us the blessed behaviour of God’s dear servants.”

*Bishop Coverdale.*

“The names of the ancient fathers should be very precious with us, and the remains of their life and labours; the first Reformers in our own land; in other lands; the good old puritans; those ministers and Christians who have been eminent in our own country. We should not despise the way of our Fathers, but be ashamed to think how short we come of them. We must regard their testimony, and, as far as it agrees with the word of God, put a great value upon it. We must follow them as far as they followed Christ.”—*Matthew Henry. Orig. M.S.*

These may be taken as a fair sample of the notes. We shall give a few more interesting specimens. The following is inserted in illustration of Mr. Henry’s ‘plain and practical way of preaching.’

‘Let your preaching be plain. Painted glass is most curious: plain glass is most perspicuous. Be a good crucifix to your people: preach a crucified Saviour in a crucified style. Paul taught so plainly that the Corinthians thought him a dunce. Let your matter be substantial, wholesome food; God and Christ and the gospel, faith, repentance, regeneration. Aim purely at God’s glory and the salvation of souls. Study, as if there were no Christ: preach, as if there had been no

study. Preach plainly, yet with novelty ; preach powerfully, as Micah, as Paul ; in intension of spirit, not extension of voice. To this end, get your sermon into your own soul. It is best from the heart to the heart. Preach prudentially,—as stewards, to give each their portion. Get you sermons *memoriter*. How can you expect your people should remember and repeat, if you read ? Yet use caution. Our memories are not of brass : they are cracked, in all, by the fall. Beware of giving occasion to say,—I may stay at home in the afternoon ; I shall hear only the same song. Mr. Porter at an Ordination.”—*From a M.S. in the handwriting of P. Henry.*’ p. 25.

These, it will be seen, are not Mr. Henry’s expressions, but Mr. Porter’s, although he may be supposed to have approved of the sentiments. The dangers of antithesis, however, may be illustrated by the very unguarded and elliptical expression, (if indeed it be correctly cited,) ‘ Study as if there were no Christ.’ What the Preacher doubtless meant was, Study your sermons as if there were no promise of aid from the Spirit of Christ. The reason given why a preacher should not read his sermons, will not be deemed very forcible. Mr. Henry’s own method was decidedly different from that which is here recommended, the getting them *memoriter* ; a practice which has been, we are aware, very successfully adopted by some of our most popular ministers, but against the general adoption of which we should be disposed to issue our *caveat*. The following account of Mr. Henry’s method is given by his Son.

‘ He wrote the notes of his sermons pretty large for the most part, and always very legible. But even when he had put his last hand to them, he commonly left many imperfect hints, which gave room for enlargement in preaching, wherein he had a great felicity. And he would often advise ministers not to tie themselves too strictly to their notes, but having well digested the matter before, to allow themselves a liberty of expression, such as a man’s affections, if they be well raised, will be apt to furnish him with. But for this, no certain rule can be given : there are diversities of gifts, and each to profit withal.

‘ He kept his sermon-notes in very neat and exact order ; sermons in course according to the order of the subject, and occasional sermons according to the Scripture order of the texts ; so that he could readily turn to any of them. And yet, though afterwards he was removed to a place far enough distant from any of that auditory, and though some have desired it, he seldom preached any of those hundreds of sermons which he had preached at Worthenbury ; no, not when he preached never so privately ; but to the last he studied new sermons, and wrote them as elaborately as ever ; for he thought a sermon best preached when it was newly meditated. Nay, if sometimes he had occasion to preach upon the same text, yet he would make and write the sermon anew ; and he never offered that to God which cost him nothing.’ p. 60.



In a note to this paragraph, the Editor refers the reader to the Lives of Dr. Staunton, Dr. Robert Harris, and Demosthenes; for what purpose, is not stated. Some further particulars respecting Mr. Henry's preaching, are furnished in an additional paragraph, taken from his manuscript papers.

‘ How sensible he was of the dislike frequently felt to practical preaching, as well as of the importance of such preaching, appears in the following extract. Having explained, in a course of sermons, the Redeemer's sayings as recorded in the fifth, sixth, and seventh chapters of Matthew's Gospel, he pressed, in his last discourse, the importance, the necessity, of *doing*, as well as hearing, from the Divine assurance that a stormy day is coming shortly, when hearers *only* will be found fools, and suffer loss; whereas hearers *and* doers will be owned for wise people, and will have the comfort of it. “What ado,” he remarks, “some one will object, is here about doing, —doing! If I had preached these sermons I know where, I had certainly been called a legal preacher, if not a papist, a jesuit, a preacher of works; and some would have said, We will never hear him again. If to preach on these things *be* legal preaching, then our Lord himself was a legal preacher, for you see they were *his* sayings all along that I took for my text to each sermon. Such a preacher as he was may I be in my poor measure! I cannot write after a better copy; I cannot tread in better steps. His sayings must be *done*, as well as heard, that we may answer his end in saying them, which was to promote holiness,—that we may approve ourselves his true kindred,—that God may be glorified,—that our profession may be beautified,—and that our building may stand. But they must be done *aright*: the tree must be good. All must be done by faith and in the name of the Lord Jesus (Heb. xi. 6. Col. iii. 17); with evenness and constancy; with humility and self-denial; in charity; and with perseverance and continuance. Do all you do as those who are under a covenant of grace, which, though it requires perfect, yet accepts of sincere obedience. While the hand is doing, let the eye be looking at Jesus Christ, both for assistance and acceptance. This is the life of faith. Be resolved in duty. Look often at the recompense of reward.” ’ pp. 136, 7.

These are obviously notes for a sermon, and may be taken as a specimen of the sort of preparation for the pulpit which Mr. Henry was accustomed to make in writing, as well as of his striking, pithy, and practical style of discoursing. ‘When he grew old,’ says his Biographer,

‘he would say, sure he might now take a greater liberty to talk, as he called it, in the pulpit; that is, to speak familiarly to people; yet, to the last, he abated not in his preparations for the pulpit, nor ever delivered any thing raw and undigested, much less any thing unbecoming the gravity and seriousness of the work. If his preaching were talking, it was talking to the purpose. His sermons were not

common-place, but even when his subjects were the most plain and trite, yet, his management of them was usually peculiar and surprising.' p. 192.

From the additional Notes, we take the following as bearing on the same subject.

'Mr. Baxter, noticing the objection as put by the Quakers,—You read your sermons out of a paper, therefore you have not the spirit,—says: "It is not want of your abilities, that makes ministers use notes, but it is a regard to the work and the good of the hearers. I use notes as much as any man when I take pains, and as little as any man, when I am lazy, or busy, or have not leisure to prepare. It is easier to us to preach three sermons without notes, than one with them. He is a simple preacher, that is not able to preach all day without preparation, if his strength would serve; especially if he preach at your rates." Church History. 4to. p. 471.' p. 441.

In the body of the work, some interesting and characteristic details are given respecting Mr. Henry's marriage; among others, the following traditional anecdote, which may rank among the good sayings of old times.

'After Mr. Philip Henry, who came to Worthenbury a stranger, had been in the country for some time, his attachment to Miss Matthews, afterwards his wife, became manifest; and it was mutual. Among the other objections urged by her friends against the connexion was this,—that although Mr. Henry was a gentleman, and a scholar, and an excellent preacher, he was quite a stranger, and they did not even know where he came from. "True," replied Miss Matthews, "but I know where he is going, and I should like to go with him." ' p. 64.

The remarks on family worship at p. 72, &c. would furnish matter for a highly useful tract.—In the Appendix, Mr. Williams has presented to us some curious and interesting documents; in particular, the notes of a public discourse at Oswestry between the Bishop of St. Asaph and some nonconformist ministers, of which Mr. Henry was one,—printed from 'an authentic manuscript.' The specimens already given of the additions and illustrations will, however, sufficiently attest the merits of the Editor's performance, and recommend the volume to the attention of our readers, as a valuable accession to every religious library.



Art. IV. *The Practice of Drawing and Painting Landscape from Nature, in Water Colours.* With observations on the Study of Nature, and various other Matters relative to the Arts. By Francis Nicholson. Second Edition. 4to. pp. 118. London, 1823.

THAT we have not given an earlier attention to this useful and gratifying essay, is owing to its having very recently fallen into our hands. We are, however, glad that it has not quite escaped us, since, though it may not be altogether such as the necessities of students require, and the skill of the Writer might have enabled him to supply, it approximates more nearly to our notions of what an elementary treatise ought to be, than any other that we have yet seen. It is chiefly defective in distinctness and compression; and this is the more to be lamented, since the exclusion of a little very unnecessary prosing would have gone far to effect the latter, and a more correct view of the nature of his task would have assisted the Writer in giving clearness and precision to his instructions. In the composition of such works as the present, there are two considerations which require to be kept especially in view. The first relates to the different circumstances of the teacher and the taught; the second, to the difference between written and personal instruction. Whoever undertakes the communication of knowledge, should place himself in the situation of the learner, and, without wasting a thought on the rounding of periods or the maintenance of systematic accuracy, should lead him patiently and *empirically*—if we may thus apply the term—from step to step, until he has fairly mastered the alphabet and the accidence; it will then be time enough to handle the syntax. There is nothing in which masters are so apt to fail, as in keeping sight of the distinction between perfection and power. They will describe, fairly enough, the manner in which an effect ought to be produced, without once referring to the way in which a scholar may be best able to produce it. In what light, were I altogether ignorant of the matter, would this stage in the processes of Art present itself to my eye? and in what terms can I best convey the true state of the difficulty, and most distinctly describe the methods of surmounting it?—are the questions which every writer on the rudiments of design ought to ask himself at every moment; and he must here submit to be instructed by those whom he is instructing, since they are better judges than himself of their own entanglements. In fact, the less learning and the more practical explanation, the greater will be the advancement of the tyro. The one he can follow with his eye, and imitate with his hand: the other belongs to an advanced stage of ac-

quisition, and is utterly wasted on those who are yet struggling with rudiments.

Again, in works like the present, too much attention cannot be paid to the obvious but unregarded distinction between written and oral instruction. In the former, the lesson may be given, and it may be illustrated by its appropriate diagram; but the one may not be rightly adjusted to the other, and perhaps neither of them may prove adequate to the exigencies of the learner. The failure is irretrievable, since the error has passed beyond the possibility of correction, and there is no medium of detailed explanation at hand. In personal direction, a slight misconception is perfectly inconsequential; the remedy is immediate. A word, a movement of the finger, a touch with the pencil can set all right in an instant. Hence, the necessity for clear and just progression and for distinct illustration, in a treatise such as this before us, is far greater than in direct communication. All exhibition, all curvetting and caracoling are miserably out of place here. We do not ask Mr. Nicholson about Cramer and Haydn, Pliny and Apelles, Vandyke and Denner, Milton and Lord Carlisle, Handel and the Royal Academy. We might feel gratified by such references in parlour-conversation; but here, we want instruction in pot-hooks and hangers, join-hand and round-text: when we have mastered these, it will be time enough to inquire about ornamental flourishes and the mysteries of calligraphy.

In these points, then, we think Mr. Nicholson to have fallen short of the perfection which he might easily have attained. He is a sound artist and a strong-minded, well-informed man. His style, although somewhat mechanical and *routinière*, is substantial and effective, as well as singularly free from the trickery and affectation which are too prevalent in the present day; and we know of no instructor from whom we would more readily receive the principles of line and colour. But he has not, as we think, kept sufficiently in view the very important distinctions to which we have referred; and though, even in its present state, his work will be highly advantageous, its utility might have been much increased by greater simplicity and more enlarged detail. There is so much bad teaching afloat in all parts of the kingdom,—such miserable misconception of the true character and object of painting is so extensively diffused, that, while we recommend the volume, in its present state, as a powerful corrective, we hope to see it, in a future edition, made the adequate and indispensable manual of all drawing-masters from the third-rate downwards, and of all pupils who are desirous to ascertain the true quality of the instructions they are receiving.



The first part professes to give a slight and general view of the nature of perspective; and this appears to us the worst executed portion of the book. There should have been more or less; either half-a-dozen simple practical *formulae* clearly laid down, or something of a connected system. The diagrams, too, are confused by an injudicious economy of space: they should, by all means, have been completely detached from each other. Still, there is much that is important even here, and the incidental observations, as well as the occasional suggestions in alleviation of difficulties, are full of instruction.

The section on Light and Shadow is extremely valuable, and the examples are judiciously selected.

‘There must,’ observes Mr. N., ‘be a principal light in some part of the picture, to which every other must be subordinate, either in brightness or in quantity; this principal mass may be in the sky, or on the objects in the landscape, it being sufficient that it is principal. If the design will admit, it should be thrown on such objects as will receive it so as to produce a pleasing form of the mass. All geometrical shapes are to be avoided. If the principal light be in the sky, the various shapes and combinations of the clouds being subject to the discretion of the artist, he has the opportunity of forming it there to the best of his judgement. The part of the picture where this and the subordinate lights can be placed with the best effect, must depend in some measure on the arrangement and combination of the various objects. It is desirable to have it rather towards the middle than the extremities, but this, not being always practicable, must depend on such circumstances as the presence of objects, ground, &c. capable of receiving it; and as great liberty may be taken in the composition of the fore-ground, objects may be, and often are, introduced there for the purpose of receiving it and increasing the breadth.

‘The secondary lights should not be fewer than two; and if they are nearly equal in brightness to the principal mass, but inferior in magnitude, the harmony and effect will be better than when they are below it in both respects; in that case, the principal light will appear as a spot, more or less according to the degree of its predominance. Lesser lights may be admitted in various parts of the picture, but they ought to be placed so as not to injure the effect of the principal light, by catching the eye and drawing the attention of the spectator from it; neither should they be allowed to cut or divide the principal breadths of shadow.

‘The disposition of shadow is governed by the same general rule; it ought to have, in like manner, its principal breadths, which should not be broken or disturbed by the admission of portions of light to separate them into smaller parts. In nature, the forms of objects are distinctly made out, principally in the lights, which are supported by the shadow floating in breadth, but with less decided form.’

This is sound and sensible instruction ; though we question the expediency of admitting, as a general practice, two secondary lights of equal brilliancy with the primary and characteristic mass. We are aware that such is the rule ; but we prefer the principle of gradation and relief, unbroken by scattered brightness. We cannot see but that the law which prevails in the pictures of Correggio, strong lights melting away by demi-tints into strong shadows, is as applicable to landscape as to figure. In portrait-painting, we have often been annoyed beyond measure by the regular introduction of some staring patch of raw light in the lower part of the picture, for the purpose of counterbalancing the effect of the head. A silver ink-stand with full-plumed pen, a white pocket handkerchief, or white lining to the dress, is often most harshly contrasted with dark drapery, in villanous aping of the fine effects of Titian, who has apparently adopted the same plan in some of his portraits ; that for instance of Aretin, so admirably rendered by the expressive graver of Van Dalen ; and in the fine picture of a Venetian nobleman with his dog and falcon. Let us have the glow of Titian's colouring diffused over the whole surface, communicating its deep and rich harmony to every part, instead of a coarse imitation of particular portions, without reference to the general feeling and effect.

We are happy to find Mr. Nicholson lending the sanction of his knowledge and practical experience to our often repeated recommendation, that the principles of light and shade—we would add, *a fortiori*, those of composition—should be studied in the *prints*, which are in every one's hands, from the old masters. The landscapes of Rubens are full of the finest instruction ; and we would recommend the thorough analysis and repeated transcription of the noble scenery of Nicholas Poussin, even in preference to that of Gaspar. The lover of beautiful nature will find it to perfection in the works of Claude. He who is in search of rich and romantic combinations needs go no further than Gaspar Poussin. They whose taste leads them to prefer the wild and savage, may take Salvador as their master. But those who can feel the pervading influence of classic grandeur and intellectual power, combined with a close observance even of the minutiae of nature, will give their days to the study of the elder Poussin. No artist ever peopled a landscape like that great painter : the adaptation of figure to scenery is complete throughout. Where the latter is merely accessory, it is made so happily subordinate as to add to the interest of the main subject, without distracting the eye. But when it takes the lead and occupies its allotted space with its fine contrasts, harmonies, and gradations, its inhabitants are



not thrown in, as is too commonly the case, without a meaning or an object, excepting such as may relate to colour and effect; they have a specific business on the spot: they are identified with the scene; and you cannot separate either from the other without positive mutilation. It may not be unacceptable to our readers, if we illustrate these statements by a specific reference to three or four of the large prints engraved from this master by Etienne Baudet. The first that occurs is a fine Italian view:—the original, if we recollect rightly, is at Dulwich. A *chaussée*, probably part of the Appian way, runs up in perspective, through the centre of the picture, with a slight inclination to the left, forming the limit of a lagoon on the right, and leading to a town and fortress in the distance. The foreground is formed by ruins of simple but impressive character, which, aided by the umbrageous foliage of the trees, with thwart gleams of glowing sunshine, gives a fine effect of light and shade. Three figures occupy this part of the picture; a man in an attitude admirably expressive of repose after fatigue, seated on the ground, leans back against a block of stone, on which lie a piece of drapery and a basket of fruit, evidently designed for a pastoral banquet; a female sits near him. These are towards the right. On the opposite side, their companion draws water in a pitcher from a deep stone reservoir, communicating with its fount, or discharging its superfluous water through a dark arch. In the middle ground are trees, water, and a church, with its campanile. The remote distance is closed by mountains and the sea. The keeping of this subject is admirable. The figures belong to the scene; the very materials of their rustic repast have been obtained from a tree of beautiful foliage, loaded with fruit, that sets off in strong sunlight against the dark masonry which shades the cool, dark spring that sleeps at its base. Bushes and broken ground are advantageously interspersed.—The second print presents a wilder scene; the Sicilian haunts of Polypheme, who seems here to assume his milder character, and rather to act as the guardian of the tranquil region, than to give terror to its inhabitants. In the immediate front is a shallow spring, lying like a lucid mirror in its gravelly basin, fringed with weeds and low foliage. Three nymphs of the fount are grouped by its side, in attitudes of alarm at the discovery of two satyrs lurking amid the bushes, close at hand. A river-god reclining on his urn is not far off. The middle ground is adorned with various groupes of trees, and enlivened by peasants engaged in various departments of rustic labour. This scene is bounded by precipitous rocks, on the crest of one of which the gigantic Cyclops reclines, playing on his 'unequal reeds.' This figure has been objected to; but

we cannot perceive the force of the objection : it is perfectly in accordance with the poetic character of the picture, and it is so managed as not to glare upon the eye in offensive distinction from the general effect. In an assemblage of naiads, satyrs, and river-gods, Polyphemus cannot fairly be considered as an intruder. A partial opening on the right carries the eye forward to a bay, a city, and distant mountains. The next engraving has in the immediate foreground, a spring-head issuing from a bank crowned with trees and enriched with beautifully varied foliage. The lights playing on the water, catching on the weeds and branches, the pebbles lying at the bottom and on the brink, and the other accompaniments of this spot, give it exquisite beauty. On the right, where a road passes the bank, a young man, a heated traveller, stoops and drinks out of the hollow of his hand. Diogenes, who had approached the brook for the same purpose, surprised at this simple process, throws away his superfluous cup. At a short distance is seen a reclining groupe, apparently companions of the philosopher. Higher up, a river or winding lake occupies the centre ; on its left bank stand trees and buildings, crowned with a showy piece of ornamental architecture ; the ground on the right and in the distance rises to a considerable height, broken with rocks and knolls, and enriched with trees and buildings. Figures in different positions and occupations are seen on the verge of the water. The fourth is a singular and most interesting picture. On the left, in the foreground, from a low cavern in a rocky bank crowned by the tall stems of two trees, and beautifully fringed with weeds and shrubs, gushes a stream which forms, at the mouth of the cave, a low cascade. Across the broken ridge over which the water pours, there lies, in all the relaxation of death, a corpse, from which an enormous serpent is just unfolding his destructive coil, and raising his head in menace of another object which has just excited his anger. This is a man who, while walking along a path which skirts the stream on the right, has just caught sight of the fearful spectacle, and is hastening from the place with every demonstration of extreme terror. Higher up, in the centre, beside a basket which she has apparently set down from weariness, sits a female, so situated as not to see the reptile and his prey, from which she is not more than a few yards distant. The terrified traveller has, however, just attracted her attention, and her mingled fear and curiosity are well portrayed both in attitude and expression. A little further on, are three men lying in the shade, and one of them is roused by the exclamation which the female seems to be in the act of making. There is something extremely piquant in this scene. The man, who sees and feels



the full extent of his danger, the woman, whose terror is partly sympathy and partly apprehension, and both mixed with uncertainty,—the other individual, whose wonder only induces him to raise his head without shifting his lounging posture,—are all excellently conceived and contrasted both in character and relative position. The rest of the picture is made up of interesting details well combined: a beautiful groupe of trees on the right; a lake with fishermen and bathers in the centre; on the left, a bank with wood and water-fall, crested with towers and battlement; a distance of buildings and mountains.

There are four others of the same class; but these will be sufficient for our purpose, which has been, at once, to direct those of our readers who may need such intimations, to the highest sources of instruction, and to illustrate the most effective methods of combining landscape with characteristic embellishment. We could fill our Number with instances of blundering in this way. Waterloo, if we may trust our recollection, has introduced a hurdled inclosure into his etching of the death of Adonis; and Sir Joshua Reynolds rightly censured Wilson for blending common-place scenery with a mythological subject.

Mr. Nicholson's instructions for colouring are good, especially as far as the first process is concerned. Had he stopped here, and contented himself with adding such incidental hints as might have led the way to subsequent improvement, he would, we think, have done better than by describing, not very distinctly, other methods to which there is no graphic illustration. The plate of successive stages is good, but the colouring might have been more carefully attended to. The remaining sections are filled with miscellaneous matter, a great part of which will be found useful to the student.

A series of ten lithographic subjects, for practice in sketching, closes the volume: they are well selected and beautifully executed.

---

Art. V. *Recollections of Foreign Travel, on Life, Literature, and Self-Knowledge.* By Sir Egerton Bridges, Bart. 2 Vols. post 8vo. Price 18s. London. 1825.

WE have found some difficulty in coming to a satisfactory decision with regard to the genuineness and real object of these volumes. We had not read far before the suspicion was awakened, that an unwarrantable use had been made of Sir Egerton's name, by some tale-writer of the day, for the purpose of dressing out two volumes of light reading. Not having the

honour of Sir Egerton's acquaintance, we were unable to ascertain how far the character attributed to the imaginary memoir-writer corresponds to the supposed original; but it seemed to us that we could detect, mingled with the playfulness of fancy, the severity of satire in the portrait which is here presented to us. Our readers shall judge for themselves.

‘ An intense love of books from very childhood, and the pursuits for which they engendered a flame in an imaginative mind, made me always a lover of retirement, and of the scenes where it could be most peacefully enjoyed. This was increased by so extraordinary a degree of native shyness, as to take away all self-possession in society, and to make company often in the highest degree painful and irritating to me. The first eight years of my life, spent entirely in a country mansion, placed secludedly on a wooded hill, (though in a populous neighbourhood of gentry,) confirmed this timidity of disposition and temper so strongly, that it has never since been conquered, though somewhat abated. For many years, in the early part of my life, it totally took away all power to make any way in the world; and threw me out of the paths of ambition, and even of the opportunity to make common acquaintance. The most precious years of my life were passed in unprofitable and stagnant solitude. I say *stagnant*, because I am convinced that emulation and comparison are necessary for the nutrition of abilities as well as knowledge. From this defect, I soon had the mortification to see, in all directions, “boobies” (to use Dr. Sneyd Davies’s expression) “mounting over my head.” When I left college in 1783, and went to the Temple, I had scarce an acquaintance among lawyers, and was incapable of making any. I went down to the courts at Westminster; but at that time the language talked there seemed to me an unintelligible jargon; and so I continued to write *sonnets*, instead of copying pleas, and to solace myself by despising what I could not understand. I read *Blackstone*, whom I *did* seem to myself to comprehend, but who did not at all assist me in affixing meaning to the arguments I heard in court. What, however, I liked better than all the rest of *Blackstone*, was his *Lawyer’s Farewell to his Muse*, which I transcribed into the first blank leaf. Had I spent but three months in a *special pleader’s office*, all my difficulties would have vanished of themselves, almost even without a mental effort. The ordinary course of the business of life has taught me these things since, without study or professional aid. And I now persuade myself, too late, that there is no knowledge which I could have more easily mastered than that of the law. When I was young, I was capable of great labour, and loved it. I did not want amusement or exercise; I did not even like exercise; it fatigued rather than refreshed me; and I could read and write from morning even till midnight. Now I can neither read nor write after the freshness of the morning is over. How deeply I lament that I threw away this capacity of labour, when it would have opened to me a passage through life so beneficial and gratifying, without paying the price of any painful cost.



‘I was born a younger brother, and continued so till the age of forty-five; my father also remained a younger brother till his age of sixty-eight, and only survived his elder brother seven months; and yet more, the whole branch of my ancestors was of a remote juniority. My grandfather has been dead *one hundred and twelve years*, at the early age of thirty-one years and nine months. My father retired early from college to a country life, and refused to take orders for the family living of the parish where the mansion was situated. I have spent nearly *forty-four* years since his death in fitful energies, which have led to nothing.’ Vol. I. pp. 7—11.

‘I can remember one event when I was aged exactly three years and a half, at which Gray the poet was present, (but whom, I confess, I do not recollect,) and many scenes, events, feelings, and even conversations, the next year, 1767, which happened at Margate, where we spent that autumn. The next year, I remember the person and even the chariot of an uncle, who died in December 1769; and the messenger who announced the death of another relation, (my god-mother,) in the following year, 1770. Thence I scarce remember any thing till the day I was first carried to school in July 1771: that event has made an impression on me as distinct as if it happened yesterday. The picture, too, of every field about Wootton, every tree, every hedge, every look of the sky, will remain as long as my faculties last. I might well love home, for among strangers my little understanding was totally lost; I could not speak, and if I was spoken to, tears came into my eyes. I got through my lessons when I first went to school, but otherwise I scarcely ever opened my lips; I was left alone in all plays and amusements, and mixed scarcely at all with other boys. On Saturday and Sunday, a family in the neighbourhood, who lived in a very elegant manner, in a beautiful spot commanding a grand view of all the Weald of Kent, generally took me to their house; there I saw much company, but no one could ever get me to talk; I was therefore stared at, and generally considered of mental imbecility; yet I remember my kind hosts, the house, the garden, the manners, many of the incidents, the scenes of the road by which I returned, and my feelings on quitting the place to return to school, as if the whole were occurrences past not a week ago.

‘One of the greatest difficulties I have had in life has been to free myself from too strong *local* attachments. I was more than thirty years old, before I could feel that I could be happy in any residence but the spot of my nativity; and when that could not be, I settled as near it as I was able; a most unfortunate predilection to which I attribute many of the disasters and miseries of my life. I was not calculated for a narrow neighbourhood, its provincial habits, and its petty intrigues; I was soon singled out like a struck deer, to be pursued and hunted down; and when, in a work of fiction, I laid open a little of the character of my persecutors, in pictures too delicate and general to give any just cause of offence, this slight retribution was charged as an unpardonable crime.

‘I never visited the Continent till I took a short trip to Brussels and Waterloo, in September, 1816. Two years afterwards I came

to Paris and Switzerland, and have been in Italy, or at Geneva, ever since; and now, in my old age, my local attachments are completely effaced. A residence on the Continent is, in various important respects, far preferable to England. I think John Bull very greatly over-estimates his own good qualities as well as his own advantages; nor does his wealth do him all the good he supposes. A foreigner takes his plan *below* his means, and is, generally, in this respect, far more at his ease than an Englishman; he does not sacrifice so much to senseless show of establishments and equipages; and though there is a species of hospitality which habit has made necessary to an Englishman, and which, therefore, recompenses the cost, it is not only not necessary to others, but is fatiguing rather than pleasant to them. The political governments on the Continent are, no doubt, many of them bad; but I wish to refrain from mixing politics with literature, or the morality of private life, especially party politics, which are always coarse, vulgar, and deceitful: it is in the looks and the comforts of the *peasantry*, that the superiority of England over the Continent is to be found. The police of every city of Europe which I have seen, is far better than that of England. English literature is fashionable abroad, but its superiority may rationally be questioned; it excels in piquancy and fantasticality, if these be recommendations.

‘An Englishman, from robust exercise, from grosser food, and from a cold climate, is less spiritual than the people of southern Europe: when he *has* genius, and exerts it, it is more deep and grand; but all the lighter literature, especially of biography, memoirs, and literary history, is better done by the Italians and French.’

Vol. I. pp 25—9.

‘On my father’s death, my mother, who was left with a good jointure and a large disposable fortune, retired to Canterbury; and eighteen months afterwards took a lease from Lord Dudley of a mansion a mile from the town, which had been the seat of the famous admiral Sir George Rooke, whose son married Lord Dudley’s aunt, and died issueless. It was a pleasant and respectable old house; and there, in the autumn of 1782, I wrote my earliest sonnets, which my classical friend, who now presides over the common law of England, made me correct, with a severity little suited to my natural haste and carelessness. I added others, written at the same place in the autumns of 1783 and 1784, and published them in March, 1785. I find nothing in them which I would wish to alter or recall. I never varied but two words in any subsequent edition, “*askest thou*” instead of “*ask’st thou*,” as too harsh, which necessitated the omission of a monosyllabic epithet: and “*store to stréw*” instead of “*treasure strew*,” in the sonnet on *Echo and Silence*, to cure the ellipsis of “*to*.” I did not altogether belong to a poetical family, though my eldest sister wrote verses with facility, and had most of the popular English poets by heart. My brother had known Gray, the poet, who had shown great attention to him at college, and he was therefore proud of talking of him; but this was an accidental rather than an inherent taste; he had not enough of deep energy to relish him truly; he liked



little piquant things, such as epigrams, which are properly called by Edward Phillips "the fag-end of poetry," and which almost always sacrifice truth to a point. Martial was my aversion, even at school. I do not love to turn serious things into a jest; it hardens the heart. Indeed I was always either reprobated, railed at, or ridiculed for my gravity.

I had always a turn for genealogy; but I think it was not till the spring of 1783 that I paid much attention to the technicalities of heraldry. I persuade myself that I remember the very day. It was a fitful April morning when we took a long walk to visit Lord Cowper's decayed mansion, called the Moat, on the Sandwich road, about a mile and a half from Canterbury, standing in an old walled park. It was an half-timbered house, many centuries old, and had been the residence of Lord-Keeper Finch. Over the spandrils of the chimney-piece of the largest room were various arms and quarterings, I think all of the Finch family, which struck my attention; I noted their forms; and as I supposed the quarterings to be those of old Kentish families, I set myself to work, as soon as I came home, to search them out by such books as I then had. It was a day when the changing appearances of the sky, with showers of rain, had made an impression on my fancy, and set my imagination to work; and it took the turn of arraying forth feudal manners and the images of chivalrous times. The fit continued some time upon me, and I made great progress in this study. The jester is welcome to his laugh; nor do I suppose that his laugh will be at all turned aside by being reminded that Gray and young Chatterton were adepts in heraldic knowledge: it is a key to intelligence among ancient buildings, castellated and ecclesiastic, for there it is a language.

I do not think that I was happy at this period; my mind was full of projects and wild ambitions, and I attempted too many things which I had not strength to execute; and which always ended, therefore, in the destruction of my self-complacence. A month after the publication of my poems, which was in March, 1785, I met with a dreadful accident in my chambers in the Temple, by cutting the tendons of the fingers of one of my hands, which, in pulling down a window, had burst through a pane of glass. The most dreadful pains ensued; my arm was inflamed to the shoulder; I was a fortnight without sleep, and then the whole system of my frame began to be affected, even to the opposite extremities. I was removed to my sister's house in Wimpole Street, or Harley Street; then my opposite ankle became paralytic, and I could not walk: the surgeon was puzzled; old Dr. Heberden was called in: I grew worse and worse, with many strange symptoms. As I lay half-lifeless on a sofa one morning in May, with a frame convulsed in every part, and spirits which required to be cheered, Mr. Maxwell, my brother-in-law (a man of great talent and elegant literature), brought me in a bundle of Reviews, and showed me, with benevolent triumph, Maty's Review of my Sonnets. Faint as I was, it gave me a glow such as nothing else of my literary concerns has ever since given me. I languished till July, and then was removed for sea-air to Dover,

where, in the early part of autumn, I at length recovered. I was then in my twenty-third year.

‘ My faculties never recovered till I wrote *Mary de Clifford*, in the autumn of 1791, an interval of six years. During that dark period I was a mere genealogist and heraldic antiquary; my ambition for the higher pursuits of literature was totally oppressed, and almost extinguished; I lost that self-estimation, without which nothing good can be done; my shyness did not diminish; but the energies that belonged to me gathered inward in masses, and turned to morbid gloom. I lived two years and a half in Hampshire; the third I came to London, where I bought a house in a new street. I spent the autumn of 1789 in an excursion into Leicestershire and Derbyshire, with my friend and fellow-collegian, Shaw, the historian of Staffordshire; and returning the end of September, I visited the Chandos vault, and took notes of the coffin-plates at Cannons. When I arrived at my house in London, intelligence came the next morning to me, that the Duke of Chandos died at Tunbridge Wells, the day and nearly the hour I had spent in the vault at Cannons! I little thought then what vexations, and cost, and injuries, that event was to bring upon us.’ Vol. I. pp. 53—59.

‘ I never in my life had much ambition of a large acquaintance, and never the manners to procure it. The effects of my original shyness, which has always been a real misfortune to me, still adhere to me; and when I think I am neglected, I am reproached with a coldness and reserve of manner, which is construed to be the most repulsive pride and contempt; and then, when I begin to be at ease, I have a frankness which is as indiscreet as my shyness is forbidding.

‘ In truth, I have an irritation about me, which age, if it a little abates, by no means calms as it ought to do. I am apt to be too passive at first, and when roused, too violent; I cannot contradict at all, or I do it too decidedly. It never was in my nature to do any thing with moderation: I never, therefore, come out of company self-satisfied; and for this reason frequently make a resolution to avoid it, and often do decline it.’ Vol. I. pp. 98, 9.

‘ I have had griefs which cannot have had any concern with faults of my own. If ever I hint complaint, my good-natured friends are ready to remind me, that “ I only reap the fruit of the seeds of my own sowing.” I may have sown seeds of which the seed has been bitter; but the fruits I allude to were certainly never of my own sowing. I admit that I never had a grain of worldly, serpentine wisdom or prudence; but I have been pursued by merciless malignities, to which my franknesses, my indiscretions, my faults (if the world will have it so), could never give a plausible pretext.....I have had singular foes to contend with in a variety of directions. Many of them have been busy, secret, and unappeasable. Even persons have incessantly persecuted me, to whom I know not that I have given the smallest cause of offence.....Envy and jealousy are ferocious and busy in proportion as their sphere of action is narrow. They are no where therefore so mischievous as where they are provin-



cial. The first limits from which a literary man, above all others, should escape, are provincial limits. Somerville is almost the only country-gentleman, of poets, who occurs to me; and he drank himself to death at a middle age from uneasiness. The mind is made for great things, and will not, except where it is weak or dull, bear the torpor and stagnation of rural ease; and still less the mean and petty passions which are substituted to put it in motion. Without much corporeal exercise it is absolutely insufferable; and yet, much corporeal exercise is apt to oppress and palsy the intellect.

‘In my latter days, I have a great desire of locomotion; and if the expense did not deter me, would spend my time in constantly moving (with proper equipages and accommodations) from country to country. Change of air gives elasticity to the worn frame; and change of images gives impulse to the exhausted mind. My hope in society is gone; my ambition is past; the openings of life are closed to me; all advantages, if any could come, would come too late; neglect or persecution have clouded, or consumed, my days; my hair, rendered grey at thirty by early anxiety, is now as white as snow; and the furrows of my face betray the age of seventy, instead of the verge of sixty-two. I have endeavoured to keep my faculties and my heart always cheerful; and never have I, in my utmost sorrows, relaxed from literary occupation;—but I have necessarily had my attention distracted, and my powers enfeebled; and could not undertake those high intellectual tasks to which my ambition and my taste led me. I admit that I have done a good deal of idle work, and a good deal of technical work. To me, on looking back, it is wonderful that, under the circumstances, I did any thing.’

Vol. II. pp. 7—9.

‘There is an uniform complaint of my gravity and my melancholy; and therefore I suppose it must be well founded. Not only my looks are said to be chill, but all my tales, and all their characters, are censured as mournful, and delighting, as it were, in affliction and misfortune. I paint the images which involuntarily haunt my mind,—which dwell within me, and around me: I pride myself in avoiding every thing factitious. I know not what should early in life have given me this gloom; for my days of childhood were not days of sorrow or darkness: I did not begin to experience adversity till after the publication of my first poems. I believe, however, that persons of a certain imagination and a certain sensibility are always melancholy.

‘I consider that the world has not been kind to me; and I do not bear it with the surly, stern pride of Lord Byron. During my six years’ absence on the Continent, I have reason to believe that I have been sometimes treated with unprovoked disrespect by the hireling part of the press. I do not deserve it of them. They who live by literature owe me something. To me they owe the extension of their property in their labours to the end of their lives, if they survive the term of twenty-eight years; and this is surely in many cases a boon. I myself have already survived that term eleven years in my first publication; and in *Mary de Clifford* I have survived it four

years. The late Mrs. Elizabeth Carter survived her earliest publication sixty-seven years; so that in her case it would have extended her right the addition of thirty-nine years. I worked hard, and should (as most of the intelligent members of that parliament will allow) have carried my point for the amendment of the *Copyright Act*, in defiance of all the weight of the universities, had I not been cut short by the dissolution of the parliament in June, 1818. The professional part of the press, therefore, ought to spare me unmerited slights. But they may go on, if it answer their purpose in filling a *piquant* article, when they have a task to perform before they can receive their daily pay; or when they can gratify the enmity towards me of some one who can be of use to them, and whose smiles they are courting. Age has made me calm, and somewhat more resolute, and regardless of ungenerous or ignorant censure. First or last, what is true and just will find its due place; and if it be not so, no praise or flattery will long keep it afloat. Let it be that I overestimate myself,—I injure no one but myself.

‘ If all those energies which still continue to burn on the verge of sixty-two are ill directed and useless,—if they are a vapoury flame which produces neither warmth nor light, but glimmers, and flashes, and struggles, like wet fuel on a cold hearth, surrounded by damps and blights,—the cost of toil and strength is all to me,—the annoyance nothing to others.

‘ When I look back beyond the six years I have passed out of England, it seems a long and countless age, and the distance so great, that I can scarcely see distinctly the point whence I set out. I can never seriously and assuredly persuade myself that I shall see my native country again: perhaps my bones may rest there,—not as Lord Byron’s have done, covered with glory, and intensely wept over by an awe-struck and idolizing people, but silently and without notice landed beneath the frown of that beetling and immortal cliff pictured by Shakspeare, and borne in humble obscurity a few short miles to the rustic church of the wooded hill which is separated but a few paces from the neglected chamber where the light of this world first beamed upon me. I do not remember that I have visited that chamber for forty years; and it is almost as long since I slept in the house. If I reach England once more, probably I shall never have spirits to look upon those scenes again.’ Vol. II. pp. 68—71.

‘ My temper and frame are too anxious and too irritable for such services: for nothing is more assuredly true, to persons of observation, and sagacious sense, and knowledge of the world, than that the primary essential of skill and success in business is *sang-froid*, reserve, and seeming command of temper. Nothing must be combated warmly; every thing that is meant to be resisted, must be seemingly conceded; and then the cunning conceder must wind round again imperceptibly to his point, and appearing to yield every thing, must not really yield even a particle. This is a mode of self-management which is as impossible to me, as it would be to command the winds. My countenance would betray me, if my words did not; I *must* say and even *look* what I think: I cannot suppress my instantaneous and



violent risings of heart, at every veiled artifice which I perceive, every subterfuge, every attempted concealment of opinion and purpose, and every insidious perversion of fact announced with pretensions to candour and frankness. Common business is but the conflict of, or with, shufflers and gamblers who play with loaded dice.

‘Neither nature nor habits have fitted me for these things. I am only fit for the calm of domestic society; for solitude, musing, reading, writing, and a short and quiet stroll in the open air. If these are proofs of want of talent, or of inutility to life, I must submit. In the course of my life, I have been drawn at times a good deal into the vortex of business; but I have been as constantly its victim, as I have been engaged in it: the most stupid fellow always beat me;—and he beat me perhaps more easily in proportion to his stupidity: the sharp edge of my temper was always blunted, or turned back upon me, by his callousness.

‘I wish it had been my fate never to have mingled with the world; to have lived retired even in the most humble competence, where my passions could have been saved from irritation; where my pride could have been kept in calmness; and those daily and insulting mortifications, which I exert my most strenuous endeavours to raise myself above, but which either madden me, or sink me into despondence, could never have reached me. I now feel the irreversible conviction that I was not made for the bustle of society; and that every year I passed in it was but a new entanglement of chains galling at the moment, and leaving incurable wounds. The utmost we can hope is peace; and where is peace to be found but in seclusion from the passions and intrigues of mankind; in lonely contemplation; and in air and exercise, to soothe the body and produce those deep slumbers which are so much better than life? One day of complacent and noble imagination is worth a year of the best pleasures of reality!

‘Nothing in reality ever satisfies me,—or at least nothing which I find in society. All mankind seem mainly employed in mortifying, or deceiving, or robbing each other; and though they praise fantastic and charlatanic genius, pure and unsophisticated genius is the very prime object of their persecution. If I could do nothing but read a few of the very first poets, Latin, Italian, or English, and write uninterruptedly all the rest of the day, without encountering the prattle, the degrading gossip, the coldness, the frowns of the busy people who go about like evil spirits to destroy human happiness, I think I yet could recover my peace and self-complacence; and pass perhaps a few hoary years in integrity of mind. But almost all my unbroken and unmercenary exertions have been turned to poison; and almost all my ardent love of literature has brought but slights, cavils, and perversions.’ Vol. II. pp. 125—129.

‘And now I must look round, and prepare for my own *exit*:—one more letter, and I have done. I shall have filled my allotted space, and can claim no more. When I approach a close, I always think that I might have done much better than I have done; and I suppose that most sensitive minds think the same. I have omitted a great deal, and have not been so bold and open as I intended to be. I

believe that my spirits have for a month past been languid, and my mind flat and sterile. I am about to move with my family after a three years' residence; and though I love locomotion and change of air and scenery, still the expected trouble of the first effort oppresses my spirits, and breaks in upon my habits. I shall no longer be able to perform my morning task, and my industry may suffer an interruption, which may never perhaps be resumed. Nor have we fixed whither we are going; a southern and warm climate seems at present the strongest attraction: perhaps *Nice*, *Genoa*, or even *Naples* again. I have no reason to love England; she has not been a kind and just mother to me!—and as to the alliances of blood, when removed from the first degree, they commonly do more harm than good. But this is an ungrateful subject, and I will abstain.' Vol. II. pp. 302, 3

We have here given in continuity, a series of paragraphs which occur scattered through these volumes, interspersed with reflections, reminiscences, criticisms, and other miscellaneous matter, in order to present entire the singular portrait which they form when put together;—a portrait which, had it come from the hands of Geoffrey Crayon or the Author of *Annals of the Parish*, we might have thought somewhat too highly coloured for reality; but yet, who would not have pronounced it a well drawn and affecting character, and one well adapted to convey a salutary lesson to the heart? The evil consequences of a defective education, and more especially of the want of religious culture, could not be more pathetically displayed. Too much stress must not, indeed, be laid on the seclusion in which the Author is represented as having passed his early years. We all know from the case of Cowper, that an early exposure to that world in miniature, 'a mob of boys,' is no cure for constitutional timidity and shyness. Either at home or at school, in the mansion or in the cottage, such a mind may be irreparably injured by injudicious treatment, by either harshness, indulgence, or neglect. In Miss Taylor's *Poetical Remains*, Philip, the 'timid, pale, unlikely lad,' who preferred rather

'To starve for life upon his pride and quill,  
Than thrive on savings filtered through a till,'—

forms, in low life, a counterpart to the Sir Egerton of the present volumes.

'Much has been long forgotten; but I'm sure  
That I was always pensive, proud, and poor.  
Much is remembered; and I partly know  
How past events conspired to make me so.'

—————  
'To neglect alive,  
And to contempt too keenly sensitive,



Beyond my years I felt : none ever guessed  
The feelings brooding in my childish breast.

\* \* \* \* \*  
' I had some talent, but 'twas always hid,  
For want of confidence in what I did.  
Timid and bashful—nature formed me so ;  
My conscious meanness made the temper grow ;  
And now beneath a rigour too severe,  
I seemed a fool, perplexed with shame and fear.

\* \* \* \* \*  
' But yet I played a game at their expense.  
All creatures have some weapon of defence ;  
And so had I. With woman's keenness cursed,  
I saw the heart, and seeing, thought the worst ;  
Suspected evil, where I could not see,  
And motives were well analysed by me.  
Amused, though vexed, to hear the loud pretence  
Of some, who really had not half my sense ;—  
To find myself despised and counted nought,  
By those who nothing knew and nothing thought :  
I was not vain ; nor need I this repeat ;  
There was enough to check my self-conceit ;  
But yet I knew, however sad my lot,  
I had a taste, a feeling they had not.'

Philip's revenge, too, is worthy of a baronet. He does not renounce England, but he retires to a solitary hamlet on the coast of Northern Devon, and writes his recollections: only he does not seem to have had the means of publishing them.

' And so it was that he whose inward woe  
Was much too sacred for mankind to know,  
He—so refined, mysterious, and so proud,'—

was compelled to content himself with reading his own narrative to his domestic. Possibly, he feared the Reviewers.

We confess that, of the two, Philip appears to us the more real, and Sir Egerton the more imaginary character; and we are extremely unwilling to part with the idea that the volumes before us are an auto-biographical romance. Like the lady mentioned by Addison, who returned Plutarch's Lives on learning that they were true histories, we should be deprived of half the complacency excited by the well imagined character of this poetical Timon, were we to suppose it real. In that case we should, in the first place, feel called upon to offer a few critical animadversions on the opinions and remarks contained in these volumes. The following sentence, for example, which is amusing enough in the mouth of a fictitious person,

would be simply absurd if vented in sober earnest by a living writer.

‘Who now reads Fielding, Smollet, Richardson, &c.?—Who reads Boccaccio, Don Quixote, Gil Blas, Gulliver, Robinson Crusoe?—Pompous editions of them are sometimes printed to look handsome on library shelves; but nobody looks into them unless to inspect a new set of illustrative engravings. Nothing continues to be read for generations, not even history, but standard poetry.’ Vol. I. p. 41.

With regard to Fielding, Smollett, and Boccaccio, we would that the question could be answered in the negative; but could the real Sir Egerton, who is a respectable bibliographer, have committed so palpable a blunder as to ask, who reads works which are every day being re-printed in pocket editions, and of which thousands of copies are annually sold to those who buy only to read? Or could he have fallen into the gross mistake of supposing that Milton is more read than the Vicar of Wakefield, or Pope than Hume’s History of England? As to Boccaccio, he has, we presume, as many readers as Petrarch, and Cervantes is immeasurably better known, both to his countrymen and to foreigners, than Lopez de Vega or Calderon.

But were we to assume that the work before us is not a fiction, we should find ourselves, as critics, in a delicate predicament on another account; for, if the following titles are not strung together in joke,—if such works have actually appeared,—how shall we confess our ignorance? We have never heard of them.

‘I wrote my *Hall of Hellingsley* principally at Florence and Naples, one chapter at Paris, and part of the last volume at Geneva; where I also wrote *Coninsby* and *Brokenhurst*, and my *Population and Riches*, my *Gnomica*, my poem of *Odo*, and my *Anti-Critic*, and where I compiled several bibliographical works.’ Vol. I. p. 95.

Indeed, had such publications been put forth by the real Sir Egerton, we should have good reason to cite him before us for contempt of court in never having acquainted us with the fact.

But, lastly, our reluctance to receive these *Recollections* as the genuine work of a sexagenarian, springs mainly from a more serious feeling. We could excuse the Author of the supposed fiction, for having represented his literary veteran as destitute of those higher aims and hopes which raise the mind above the petty contentions and vexations of life, infusing that peace which the world cannot destroy. For the sake of pointing the moral of his tale, we could excuse his making his Sir Egerton ask, Where is peace to be found? and return the sorry, cheerless answer to his own question—‘In seclusion,



‘lonely contemplation, air and exercise, and slumbers which are so much better than life!’—while he makes him add the touching confession, that even in these, *he* finds no peace. In the Philip of Miss Taylor, however, the same lesson is more happily conveyed.

‘In milder moods I looked from side to side,  
For better comfort than I gained from pride.  
Is there no object more sublimely bright,  
More worthy high pursuit, than worlds of light?  
Is there no refuge for the poor oppressed?  
For weary wanderers is there not a rest?  
Cast out of men, despised by all about,  
Is there no friend who will not cast me out?’

If these volumes are really the production of a man verging on age, the total absence of any thing approaching to a religious idea, suggests reflections too painful to excite any other feeling than sincere commiseration. Towards the close of the work, our eye was caught by the words, ‘stealing its silent way into eternity;’ and a few lines below occur the expressions, ‘And now I must look round and prepare for my own exit.’ Here, we thought, is at last an indication that our Sexagenarian is beginning to turn his mind to higher themes. But, to our disappointment, we found, on examination, that what is spoken of as stealing its way into eternity, is a recent poetical work; and the only exit that Sir Egerton is thinking of is—closing his volume! At page 75 of the same volume he tells us, that Dean Milner, one of the tutors of his college when he was at Cambridge, ‘latterly took a religious turn.’ Happy would be the *turn* that should make the latter end of Sir Egerton like *his*! It is not likely that this article will ever meet his eye, or we could assure him that we do not rank among either his detractors, persecutors, or enemies. These volumes have excited an interest, of which pity is certainly an element, but pity unmingled with any disrespectful feeling. If he would listen to us, there is a *recipe* which we would fain prescribe for all his ills, real or imaginary; it is contained in those words: ‘Come unto ME, all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest.’

- Art. VI. 1. *Review of the Conduct of the Directors of the British and Foreign Bible Society, relative to the Apocrypha and to their Administration on the Continent.* With an Answer to the Rev. C. Simeon, and Observations on the Cambridge Remarks. By Robert Haldane, Esq. 8vo. pp. 148. Price 2s. 6d. Edinburgh, 1825
2. *Second Statement of the Committee of the Edinburgh Bible Society, relative to the Circulation of the Apocrypha by the Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society.* 8vo. pp. 152. Price 2s. Edinburgh, 1826.

WE suspect that most of our readers are by this time sick of the very word Apocrypha, and heartily tired of the controversy relating to it. Many persons were led to imagine, that when once the Parent Committee had adopted the recommendation of the Special Committee to exclude the Apocrypha, there would be an end of all difference and difficulty, and that the Society, having cleared the reef, would pursue its majestic course in calm water. The Resolution adopted is as follows.

‘That the Funds of the Society be applied to the printing and circulation of the Canonical Books of Scripture, to the exclusion of those Books and parts of Books which are usually termed Apocryphal; and that all copies, printed either entirely or in part at the expense of the Society, and whether such copies consist of the whole or of any one or more of such Books, be invariably issued bound; no other books whatever being bound with them; and further that all money grants, to societies or individuals, be made only in conformity with the principle of this regulation.\*

This resolution is pronounced by the Edinburgh Committee ‘unsatisfactory,’ and Dr. Andrew Thomson has been employed to draw up this new indictment against the London Committee, which, we regret to say, has been adopted as the statement of the Edinburgh Committee, the Rev. Mr. Craig alone protesting against its official adoption. The length to which party spirit will carry even good men, has seldom been more strikingly evinced, than in the sanction thus unhesitatingly given to a document deficient in every quality which should have recommended it to a religious committee. Its bold and incorrect assertions, its disregard of all the courtesies of controversy, and its violent and intolerant spirit render it worthy of the pen from which it issues,—a pen which is accustomed to deal in acrimony, and which has been compelled to apologise for its own libels; but if this be the spirit of the Edinburgh Committee, we can only regret that the gift of exorcism has ceased.

---

\* Missionary Register for 1825, p. 556.



Dr. Thomson opens his pleading by declaring the question involved in the discussion to be 'important beyond any thing which ever engaged the attention of the Christian world;' and in support of this most extravagant assertion, he represents the question as referring to a species of abuse 'which affects the very foundation of our hope, and which, after all the admiration and gratitude with which the British and Foreign Bible Society has been contemplated, leaves it *doubtful whether we have not more reason to lament the evil it has committed, than to rejoice at the good it has accomplished.*' Such is the spirit, such the views with which this champion 'enters the lists,' to use his own phrase, with the London Committee. Unhappily, however, he is not alone. Mr. Robert Haldane, a man of a very different temper, and whose only fault appears to spring from his being somewhat too much attached to his own opinions and his own way of doing good, which he has an undoubted right to deem the best, if he would but allow the same liberty to those who differ from him,—has issued a pamphlet denouncing the whole foreign administration of the Bible Society, from the beginning until now, as altogether erroneous in principle and mischievous in result. He avows his object to be, a total change of management. In fact, he wishes the Bible Society to be remodelled on the plan of the Continental Society,—a very admirable institution, but which, we confess, we should not like to see built up on the ruins of the British and Foreign Bible Society. The object of both pamphlets is, to open the eyes of the public to the unfitness of Lord Teignmouth and others, the Vice-presidents, secretaries, and Committee of the semi-popish confederacy in question, and to shew the necessity of some such reform as should replace its present patrons by presbyters instead of prelates, its committee by leal and true men from the North, and its secretaries by some Andrew Thomson. As to the goodness of Mr. Haldane's design, we unfeignedly declare that we do not harbour a doubt; and if in the course of the discussion we should find ourselves compelled to adopt the language of censure and even indignant remonstrance, we must once for all profess, that we honour his zeal, his disinterested and munificent generosity, his talents, and his piety too highly to have any pleasure in holding him up to public reprehension for the mistaken, and, we think, very blameable part which he has taken in this pamphlet.

But first, we must address ourselves to Dr. Thomson and the Edinburgh Committee; and it is fit that our readers should know on what grounds the Resolution above cited has been pronounced unsatisfactory. They may be briefly summed up as follows.

would be simply absurd if vented in sober earnest by a living writer.

‘Who now reads Fielding, Smollet, Richardson, &c.?—Who reads Boccaccio, Don Quixote, Gil Blas, Gulliver, Robinson Crusoe?—Pompous editions of them are sometimes printed to look handsome on library shelves; but nobody looks into them unless to inspect a new set of illustrative engravings. Nothing continues to be read for generations, not even history, but standard poetry.’ Vol. I. p. 41.

With regard to Fielding, Smollett, and Boccaccio, we would that the question could be answered in the negative; but could the real Sir Egerton, who is a respectable bibliographer, have committed so palpable a blunder as to ask, who reads works which are every day being re-printed in pocket editions, and of which thousands of copies are annually sold to those who buy only to read? Or could he have fallen into the gross mistake of supposing that Milton is more read than the Vicar of Wakefield, or Pope than Hume’s History of England? As to Boccaccio, he has, we presume, as many readers as Petrarch, and Cervantes is immeasurably better known, both to his countrymen and to foreigners, than Lopez de Vega or Calderon.

But were we to assume that the work before us is not a fiction, we should find ourselves, as critics, in a delicate predicament on another account; for, if the following titles are not strung together in joke,—if such works have actually appeared,—how shall we confess our ignorance? We have never heard of them.

‘I wrote my *Hall of Hellingsley* principally at Florence and Naples, one chapter at Paris, and part of the last volume at Geneva; where I also wrote *Coninsby* and *Brokenhurst*, and my *Population and Riches*, my *Gnomica*, my poem of *Odo*, and my *Anti-Critic*, and where I compiled several bibliographical works.’ Vol. I. p. 95.

Indeed, had such publications been put forth by the real Sir Egerton, we should have good reason to cite him before us for contempt of court in never having acquainted us with the fact.

But, lastly, our reluctance to receive these Recollections as the genuine work of a sexagenarian, springs mainly from a more serious feeling. We could excuse the Author of the supposed fiction, for having represented his literary veteran as destitute of those higher aims and hopes which raise the mind above the petty contentions and vexations of life, infusing that peace which the world cannot destroy. For the sake of pointing the moral of his tale, we could excuse his making his Sir Egerton ask, Where is peace to be found? and return the sorry, cheerless answer to his own question—‘In seclusion,



Art. VI. 1. *Review of the Conduct of the Directors of the British and Foreign Bible Society, relative to the Apocrypha and to their Administration on the Continent. With an Answer to the Rev. C. Simeon, and Observations on the Cambridge Remarks.* By Robert Haldane, Esq. 8vo. pp. 148. Price 2s. 6d. Edinburgh, 1825

2. *Second Statement of the Committee of the Edinburgh Bible Society, relative to the Circulation of the Apocrypha by the Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society.* 8vo pp. 152. Price 2s. Edinburgh, 1826.

WE suspect that most of our readers are by this time sick of the very word Apocrypha, and heartily tired of the controversy relating to it. Many persons were led to imagine, that when once the Parent Committee had adopted the recommendation of the Special Committee to exclude the Apocrypha, there would be an end of all difference and difficulty, and that the Society, having cleared the reef, would pursue its majestic course in calm water. The Resolution adopted is as follows.

‘That the Funds of the Society be applied to the printing and circulation of the Canonical Books of Scripture, to the exclusion of those Books and parts of Books which are usually termed Apocryphal; and that all copies, printed either entirely or in part at the expense of the Society, and whether such copies consist of the whole or of any one or more of such Books, be invariably issued bound; no other books whatever being bound with them; and further that all money grants, to societies or individuals, be made only in conformity with the principle of this regulation.\*

This resolution is pronounced by the Edinburgh Committee ‘unsatisfactory,’ and Dr. Andrew Thomson has been employed to draw up this new indictment against the London Committee, which, we regret to say, has been adopted as the statement of the Edinburgh Committee, the Rev. Mr. Craig alone protesting against its official adoption. The length to which party spirit will carry even good men, has seldom been more strikingly evinced, than in the sanction thus unhesitatingly given to a document deficient in every quality which should have recommended it to a religious committee. Its bold and incorrect assertions, its disregard of all the courtesies of controversy, and its violent and intolerant spirit render it worthy of the pen from which it issues,—a pen which is accustomed to deal in acrimony, and which has been compelled to apologise for its own libels; but if this be the spirit of the Edinburgh Committee, we can only regret that the gift of exorcism has ceased.

---

\* Missionary Register for 1825, p. 536.

1. The Resolution does not contain a distinct recognition of the fundamental law and principle of the Society.

2. 'It speaks of the books which are usually termed Apocryphal.'

3. The Resolution may be evaded, and 'the pretended honour of the Societies, or of individuals, is no bar to this.'

4. 'The London Committee is not to be trusted.'

The last of these counts is, it will be seen, the capital one. And indeed, this being established, it would seem quite superfluous to cavil at the language of the Resolution. Dr. Thomson and his friends were evidently prepared to object to *any* Resolution, as unsatisfactory. A Committee guilty of so much 'disingenuousness,' 'contumacy,' 'shifting,' 'ambiguity,'—a Committee that has actually proceeded to the iniquitous length of circulating a Bible with *marginal references*!!—is not to be trusted; they may 'resolve and re-resolve, and *do* the same.' We are tempted to bring up the culprits before our readers by name.

'Of the twenty-one members comprising the Special Committee, there are at least *sixteen* who were known at the time to be favourable to Apocryphal distribution' (Dr. Thomson means distribution of the Apocrypha) 'in any form that circumstances might suggest. The following is a list of the Committee.

Lord Teignmouth, *President*.

The Bishop of Litchfield and Coventry.

Lord Calthorpe.

Lord Bexley.

Sir R. H. Inglis, Bart. M.P.

William Wilberforce, Esq.

} *Vice-Presidents.*

Rev. J. W. Cunningham.

Rev. W. Dealtry.

Rev. W. Orme.

Rev. Josiah Pratt,

Rev. Charles Simeon.

Rev. D. Thorpe.

Thomas Allan, Esq.

Joseph Butterworth, Esq. M.P.

Zachary Macauley, Esq.

Richard Phillips, Esq.

Robert Steven, Esq.

Joseph Trueman, Esq.

Rev. Andrew Brandram.

Rev. Joseph Hughes.

Rev. C. F. A. Steinkopff.

} *Secretaries.*

We suppose these to be men who will remain firm to their conscientious opinions; and it is very much on that account that we hold them most unfit for the office which was assigned to them. Because, if they were really convinced that the circulation of the Apocrypha was innocent in itself, and essential to the success of the Bible Society abroad, they could not be conceived capable of relinquishing that practice for the purpose of satisfying any body of complainers, or for answering any inferior end whatever. And remaining in the direction, and agreeing to perform the duty committed to them, we are entitled



to conclude, that it was under the impression that such a resolution could be concocted as would gain over the great bulk of those who were discontented, and yet leave an opening for continuing to do that which created the discontent, and which cannot be done avowedly, without exciting universal opposition.'

We are not sufficiently acquainted with the personal sentiments of the individual members of the Committee, to be able to point out the Apocryphal sixteen; and we have strong doubts as to the accuracy of Dr. Thomson's representation. But all who assisted in concocting the resolution are obviously involved in Dr. Thomson's libellous charge. Not only so, but the whole of the Parent Committee, by whom it was adopted, are equally guilty of the attempt to impose on the public.

'To those who have not watched and followed the London Committee through all their *windings*,' says this reverend gentleman, 'the resolution will bear an aspect of conciliation, and explicitness, and abundant concession; but to those who regard it with the *wholesome jealousy* which the Committee itself has taught them to cherish, and who are resolved to be satisfied with no half measure, we have no doubt that the resolution, though *veiled* in a more dexterous phraseology than those which preceded it, is, in its real import and tendency, as far away as any one of them from that great and pure purpose for which we have all along been contending.'

Here, then, is a distinct charge brought against three noblemen of the highest respectability, a distinguished prelate, nine clergymen and Dissenting ministers, two members of the House of Commons, and six other gentlemen, of a deliberate attempt to deceive the religious public. That Dr. Thomson should bring the charge, does not so much astonish us as that he should get a body of Scotch presbyterian ministers and gentlemen to back him in it. Who then, the public have a right to ask, are this Dr. Thomson, and Dr. Davidson, and Dr. Peddie, &c. &c. that, laying aside the courtesy of gentlemen and the charity of Christian ministers, they should join in preferring so serious a charge against the integrity of men their equals, in some respects more than their equals? Shame, shame upon them! The imputation can disgrace only those who are the authors of it.

We are far from holding that the Committee of the Bible Society, or of any other society, can do no wrong, or even from maintaining that the London Committee have not erred. Their great error has been an apparent vacillation and indecision, which have, we are persuaded, done more mischief than all the statements of the Edinburgh Committee. Dr. Thomson complains, 'that they have all along done too much to meet the wishes of others,'—he basely adds, 'as well as to gratify

'their own.' We think that their anxiety to conciliate has been carried to an extent that has paralysed their friends, without satisfying their enemies. The Committee were entitled to take higher ground; and had they at once come forward with a manly, explicit statement of their determination, leaving it to a general meeting of the Society to sanction or to disapprove their proceedings, the ferment would soon have subsided. That they have not taken this course, though it is matter of regret, is easily to be accounted for. In the first place, the Committee, it is well understood, were not fully agreed either as to the principle or the expediency of their own uniform practice. Strange to say, certain members of their own body, who for twenty years had actively and knowingly concurred in assisting foreign societies with money grants, all at once made the discovery, that every such grant, from the very first year of the Society's operations, had been improper. This sudden illumination, we have never been able to account for. One member of the Special Committee is understood to have framed a resolution of so violent a character, that he found no one to second it. But in the next place, the Committee were prevented from taking a more decided part, by the consideration, that the public, of whose contributions they were the trustees, have the ultimate right to prescribe how the funds of the Society should be disposed of. With this view, they were for the most part disposed not to consult their own feelings, nor even to follow up their own convictions, so much as to collect the opinions of the auxiliary societies and the sentiments of the subscribers at large. The information brought them was, as might be expected, various and contradictory; hence their apparent indecision; hence their vibrating resolutions, which have given a handle and a paltry triumph to Dr. Thomson and his friends; and hence, at length, a final determination, which, being meant as a concession, is charged with being both a blind and a compromise. In this conduct on the part of the Committee, however, we can perceive nothing either deceptive or dishonourable. Divided as they were in opinion among themselves, the only plan, it may be thought, that was left, was, to endeavour to collect the opinions of the public. We believe that a nice feeling of responsibility, as well as an anxiety to prevent any interruption in the harmony of the Society, dictated this cautious proceeding. Every apparent vacillation has been immediately occasioned by representations from without. They have only given ear too patiently, and given way too timidly. They should firmly have adhered to the practice of twenty years, and have suffered the Edinburgh Committee to secede as they wished to do.



But Dr. Thomson cannot conceive, and he thinks nobody else can, how any members of a Committee, convinced that they had done right in assisting foreign societies, could relinquish that practice to satisfy any body of complainers, without the secret intention to compass their object by covert and dishonest means. He has no idea of a man's giving up his opinion. Concession, in his view, implies dishonesty, and obstinacy is the test of virtue. A minority, on his principle, should never yield, nor a representative body sacrifice their private convictions to the wishes of their constituents. If the members of the London Committee cannot do all the good they wish, they ought, it seems, to refuse to act at all. They have done wrong, we are told, to relinquish their practice, to satisfy any body of complainers: they should have turned out, like honest men, on finding that they could not carry things their own way, and then, Dr. Thomson would have thought better of them. These gentlemen may, however, justly consider it as treatment not altogether fair, that Dr. Thomson, judging of their temper and spirit by his own, should represent them as incapable of relinquishing any practice they had once adopted, and of the propriety of which they were satisfied, without some sinister intention, some unworthy motive: *he* cannot conceive of the thing, but few persons, we imagine, possessed of the smallest degree of candour, will find any difficulty in the matter.

Whatever might be the private convictions of any members of the London Committee as to the lawfulness and propriety of the existing practice, they found themselves at last compelled to defer to the clamour that had been raised, or risk the peace and integrity of the Society; and one consideration which was made use of to induce them to accede to the Resolution, was this; That, in relinquishing the practice, they made no sacrifice of conscience, whereas the plea of conscience was urged by the objectors. But Dr. Thomson tells them, that they ought not to have suffered this consideration to weigh with them; and, on this point, we are disposed to agree with him. The rule of giving no offence, of following after the things which make for peace, of bearing with the scrupulosities of the weak, it becomes every Christian to observe in his private conduct, nor is he in any danger of carrying it too far. But neither the Bible Society nor any other religious association can be conducted on any such principle. The conscience of one person will not allow him to give away a Bible without the prayer-book; the conscience of another is scandalized by marginal references; a third cannot conscientiously adhere to a Society that gives away a version that he deems exception-

able; a fourth denounces the Society because there are Socinians among its members. Every objector, from Mr. Haldane down to Mr. Norris, takes his stand upon the ground of conscience. As Luther, however, appealed from the Pope ill-informed to the Pope when he should receive more full information, so, the Committee, while they acknowledge no higher tribunal than Conscience, would still have their appeal from Conscience ill-informed to Conscience more fully instructed. Unfortunately, they seem to have been taken by surprise by the publication of the Edinburgh Statement: a proceeding so invidious and so malignant, they were not prepared for in such a quarter. And the religious public were not less unprepared for the calm discussion of a question thus suddenly brought before them. The want of information that has been discovered to exist, is truly surprising; alarms and prejudices, founded on misapprehension and mistake, have consequently been with too much facility excited in the minds of persons to whom the whole subject was new, by those who ought to have known better. In this instance, as in some other cases, where there has been the least light, there has been the most heat; and many persons have quarrelled with the Bible Society for no better reason than their own ignorance.

But to return to Dr. Thomson's charges against the Committee. His first reason, we have seen, for objecting to the Resolution is, that it does not contain a distinct recognition of the fundamental law and principle of the Society; from which he candidly infers, that they did not intend to abide by their own Resolution. A very few words will be sufficient to shew why the Committee did not, and why they *ought not* to have passed a resolution of the kind which their Scotch correspondents stickled for. Dr. Thomson is pleased to say, that the Committee 'have forgotten that they are the executive, and not 'the legislative branch of the Institution.' The legislative branch would appear to be the Edinburgh Committee. Dr. Thomson's distinction, however, is an absurd one. Every executive committee is a legislative branch, so far as regards the framing of all necessary by-laws and regulations for the management of its proper business. Every such committee is entrusted with legislative powers to a certain extent; and it may be placed in circumstances which require and justify its exceeding those powers, trusting to an act of indemnity and approval on the part of the general body at the annual revision of their proceedings, when their power expires. We admit, however, that no executive committee can have power to alter or violate the fundamental laws of a society: such alteration may become necessary, and it will then be their duty to



recommend it to the adoption of a general meeting, which we suppose no one, unless it be Dr. Thomson, will deny to have that power. But if a Committee has not a legislative right extending to any alteration of a fundamental law, neither can it come within their province to pass a *declaratory* law affecting the very constitution of the Society. A declaratory law, making a pre-existing law binding in a certain sense, the meaning of which had previously been undefined or disputed, has always been understood to require the same legislative powers as the issuing of an original enactment. The Committee might have declared their private views of the fundamental rule in question, had they been agreed in their views; but they had no right to declare the rule to be, what a very large portion of the Society maintain it *not* to be, and what the practice of twenty years, the best expositor of any rule so far as regards the intention of its framers, disproves it to have been. Supposing, then, for argument's sake, that the Scotch view of the rule were the right one, and that the Committee had all become converts to this view, we maintain that they would have exceeded their province in passing a resolution affirming, or what Dr. Thomson calls recognising, an interpretation of the rule which only a general meeting can determine to be binding. Nor can even a general meeting affirm with truth that such has been the rule: it can only decree the sense in which it shall be taken in future. Opposite views have been taken of it; and the uniform practice of a series of Committees annually chosen, has been guided by those opposite views. Yet, because the London Committee did not pass a resolution stultifying themselves, condemning their predecessors, exceeding their own powers, and contradicting what many believe to be fact, their conduct is pronounced 'unsatisfactory.' Dr. Thomson wanted them to cry *confiteor*, and then, possibly, he might have deigned to say to them, *ego te absolvo*. He treats them throughout as culprits who had wilfully 'disputed, as well as thwarted,' the law 'whose meaning they have now 'ascertained, as well as professed a determination to obey.' 'We do not wish,' says this valiant presbyter,—'we demand 'and insist upon a dutiful and strict adherence to the law of 'the Society.' It may be questioned whether the former Governor-general of India, the Bishop of Litchfield, or Lord Bexley, was ever talked to with this heroic boldness before. Surely, the spirit of John Knox has revisited the earth in the avatar of Andrew Thomson. But we beg pardon for seeming to confound two things so infinitely different, as the holy courage of the martyr and the mock majesty of the pedagogue.

The second objection is founded, we regret to say, on either

a most disingenuous perversion or an astonishing oversight of fact. The Resolution speaks of the books usually termed Apocryphal.

‘This sounds ill,’ says Dr. Thomson, ‘when coming from one body of Protestants to another; and it is more than strange when addressed by the Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society to the friends and lovers of the Bible throughout this gifted empire. Such a circumlocution did not formerly obtain among us when speaking on the subject. The Apocrypha was just called the Apocrypha, by the London Committee, and by the Edinburgh Committee, and by all other Committees in the kingdom. It was denounced and excluded as unworthy of any place in the inspired record. No qualifying phrase was employed to render its sentence of condemnation less severe. All agreed in simply and steadily denominating it the Apocrypha. But now, a more measured and cautious language is made use of when it is mentioned. Now that it is getting a decree of banishment pronounced against it, certain honied words are connected with it, which may indicate that the treatment it is receiving is rather worse than it deserves. It is no longer the Apocrypha, but the books which are usually termed the Apocrypha; as if, in the opinion of the London Committee, our views of its want of all claim to the character and authority of Divine revelation, were not so indisputably sound as we had ventured to imagine.’

But *was* this Resolution addressed simply by one body of Protestants to another? Dr. Thomson is quite aware that this does not truly represent the fact. He knows that the Resolution was anxiously looked for by foreign societies of different communions, and that it was *not* meant to circulate only throughout this ‘gifted empire.’ Could he for a moment imagine, that the Edinburgh Committee was the only one that the London Committee thought of?—that Dr. Thomson was the uppermost thought in their minds? Or does he think that to render their phraseology palatable to him and his friends should have been their main solicitude? If so, he immensely over-calculates his own importance. But still, he must have known, that the Resolution was framed with a view to its being transmitted to the Continental Societies, as a reason for a total alteration of what had been the uniform practice of the British Society;—a very sufficient reason, by the way, why it could not with propriety distinctly recognise the fundamental rule in a sense at variance with that established practice. Dr. Thomson knows, at the same time, that there are among the members of the London Committee, clergymen and gentlemen whose views of the Apocrypha are the same as his own; nor has he the slightest reason to suppose that, by a



single individual, its 'want of all claim to the character and 'authority of Revelation' is doubted. What then must now be thought of his inflammatory tirade? He is aware that his objection may be thought 'hypercritical.' We should scarcely have deemed it worthy of notice, had it not been dishonest.\*

We have perhaps dwelt too long on this part of the subject, and shall now permit Dr. Thomson to withdraw for the present, while we endeavour to disabuse our readers with regard to the true character, object, and principle of the British and Foreign Bible Society. Our readers will recollect that, at the very commencement of our observations on this dispute, in our Number for September last, we adverted to Mr. Douglas's eloquent exposition of the plan and design of the Institution, as expressing those views which have all along guided us in the discussion. His words are, that the Bible Society 'becomes a rallying point for *all Christians*, as it affords a basis 'of union broad enough to admit every varying shade of 'opinion, and lifts up a conspicuous standard to all those who 'are engaged in earnest in furthering the Redeemer's kingdom;' that 'it combines all classes and all creeds; and that 'those who build precious things, and those who heap up stubble 'upon the foundation of the Scriptures, have here one point of 'agreement in the foundation for which they both earnestly 'contend;' that 'it oversteps the boundaries of kingdoms, 'and the separation of national jealousies, and presents a 'field wide enough for men of all nations and languages to 'enter, without conflicting or jarring with each other.' Mr. Simeon holds similar language. 'We have,' he says, 'all 'agreed to merge our own peculiarities, and to forget every 'thing which separates us from one another for the benefit of 'the world.' And the declaration of the Society in its first advertisement, fully warrants this view.

'The principles upon which this undertaking will be conducted, are

---

\* We are not sure, however, (not being in the secrets of the Earl-street Committee,) that this Resolution may not after all have been drawn up by some sound member of the Kirk of Scotland, who might have in his recollection the phraseology of Article III. in Chap. I. of the Confession of Faith approved by the General Assembly, and ratified by Act of Parliament, 1649. It runs thus: THE BOOKS 'COMMONLY CALLED APOCRYPHA, not being of Divine Inspiration, 'are no part of the canon of Scripture, and therefore are of no 'authority in the church of God, nor to be any otherwise approved 'or made use of than other human writings.' Was Dr. Thomson not aware of the language of the Confession of his own Church?

as comprehensive as the nature of the object suggests that they should be. In the execution of this plan, it is proposed to embrace the common support of Christians at large, and to invite the concurrence of persons of every description who profess to regard the Scriptures as the proper standard of faith.\*

To this distinguishing feature in the Society's constitution, Mr. Haldane, in the twenty-first year of its operation, comes forward to object. After citing Mr. Simeon's words, he exclaims :

‘ Is it possible, when Mr. Simeon speaks of merging peculiarities, and “ of all sects and parties meeting upon one common basis,” that he can refer to Arians and Socinians ? Does he esteem them to be Christians ? I will venture to say, he does not ; and that, when he spoke of all meeting upon one common basis, he had in his mind the basis of the Gospel.’

Mr. Simeon's words are so plain, and his meaning so clear, that it is not a little singular that Mr. Haldane should attempt to wrest or mistify them. It is clear, that he had not in his mind the basis of the Gospel, but the ‘ common basis’ of the broad principle on which the Institution was founded. The only basis of a society must be its laws ; and it is of these Mr. Simeon is speaking, and of the ‘ common work’ in which all sects and parties are invited to concur, namely, the circulation of the Holy Scriptures. The Bible Society is not a *propaganda* Society : it has always disclaimed this character. Its object, therefore, is not to send out men to preach the Gospel. It has consequently no creed to expound, no dogmas to defend ; it requires no confession of faith on the part of its members, imposes no solemn league or covenant, nor does it pronounce any sentence of reprobation on either Arians or Socinians, Turks, Jews, Papists, or Infidels. Mr. Haldane is at full liberty to object to the constitution of such a society, as too liberal, too catholic, too comprehensive ; but he is not at liberty to lay his own creed as the foundation of the Society, and then attack the Committee for not adhering to it. Mr. Haldane remarks (at p. 139), ‘ that the preaching of the word preceded, at the beginning, the circulation, and even the publication of the Scriptures,’ and that ‘ before even the transactions of his life were recorded, the Divine Author of the Gospel sent forth his missionaries into all the world.’ This remark occurs in connexion with his complaint, that the members of the Bible Society hesitate to encourage the preaching of the Gospel in Christian countries. Here, we discover the

---

\* Appendix to the First Report. p. 25.



real source of his dissatisfaction with the Society. It would be easy to shew, that the view he has taken of the circumstances attending the first propagation of the Gospel, is a partial and incorrect one. The preaching of the word was in the first instance directed to the Jews, and did *not* precede the publication of their Scriptures. "For Moses of old time had in every city them that preached him, being read in the synagogues every sabbath day;" and to these Scriptures, our Lord and his apostles uniformly appealed as testifying the truth of what they taught. How early the transactions of our Lord's life were recorded, is uncertain. By many learned men, the Gospel of St. Matthew is believed to have been written within seven, or even four years of the descent of the Spirit; and all St. Paul's epistles were written between A.D. 52 and 67. Mr. Haldane's reasoning, if it has any weight, must be built either on the *insufficiency* of the Scriptures, or the unlawfulness of reversing a decreed order of proceeding. But whatever his opinions may be, it is expecting somewhat too much, to require that the Bible Society should remodel itself in accommodation to his plan of preaching the Gospel.

In this 'gifted empire,' under the protection of British laws, any person or persons may associate for the purpose of promoting the spiritual welfare of men by either preaching or the circulation of the Scriptures and religious tracts. On the European Continent, a similar liberty is unknown. How laudable soever the object, if it require a public union, its plan must obtain the previous sanction of the powers that be; and after permission has been conceded, a vigilant eye marks all the proceedings, and if these are supposed to militate in any way against the established order of things, the progress of the institution is immediately arrested. This being the case, it seemed the part of Christian prudence, and in no wise at variance with Christian rectitude, to conciliate the patronage of men high in office, both in Church and State, in the formation of Bible Societies, since without their sanction and co-operation the object could never have been obtained. But Mr. Haldane is indignant at this proceeding. Persons unsound in the faith (according to Mr. Haldane's theology), whatever be their rank in society, ought not, it seems, to be consulted in the matter; they are unworthy of being acknowledged as co-operators in the distribution of the Holy Scriptures. The civil and ecclesiastical powers of Europe are alike to be set at naught by the Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society and its agents, as the readiest way to promote the interests of the Gospel; and open hostilities are to be commenced with all the public religious instructors and

pretended pastors of the Protestant world, as too impure a medium for conveying the Bible to the public.

‘Is it to be tolerated,’ he exclaims, ‘that, over the whole of the Continent, the chosen friends of the British and Foreign Bible Society, those whom it generally *appoints* or countenances as the leaders in the various Bible Societies which it creates, shall be Arians, Socinians, or Freethinkers? Is it to be connived at, that *through their hands*, the Scriptures shall be delivered to the people; thus giving all the sanction in its power to the characters, the opinions, and the qualifications of these men as public religious instructors—while at the same time, the leading directors of the British and Foreign Bible Society, as well as the various denominations of Christians throughout Britain, by whom the Society is upheld, are convinced that the religious systems of these pretended pastors are as completely opposed to the Gospel, and as subversive of the whole system of Divine truth contained in the Bible, as the grossest system of Pagans, Deists, or Atheists.’ p. 135.

We believe Mr. Haldane to be incapable of intentional misrepresentation, but this statement is certainly far from being either a sober or an ingenuous one. The idea of a Committee of gentlemen in Earl-street issuing their *appointments* to the magistrates and ecclesiastical authorities of the continent, and directing them to take the lead in the various Bible Societies, is not a little amusing. The London Committee can have no power either to appoint or to exclude, to nominate or to reject. And from Mr. Haldane’s own shewing, they would have had no room for choice, even had they had the prerogative. ‘From the Continent of Europe,’ he says, ‘the light of Divine truth, with which it was once eminently favoured, *has been withdrawn* ;’ and according to the dark picture which he draws of the state of the continental churches, the Committee were compelled to accept of such co-operation, or abandon all attempts of the kind. But really, when he talks of their ‘*installing* Arians, Socinians, and Neologists, Deists and Atheists, as the counsellors and directors of the Bible Societies abroad,’—when he speaks of their agents ‘going forth in the name of a great Society, empowered to give grants of money, to erect societies with presidents, secretaries, treasurers,’ &c.—as if the Earl-street Committee had at their disposal, places and pensions, stars and titles, or at least salaries and gold snuff-boxes,—his fancy must be allowed to have run away with his judgement. Since the dissolution of the connexion between the Russian Bible Society and the British Institution, *two* individuals, and *two* only, we have reason to believe, can be considered as in the employ of the British Society on the Continent, and one of these is in a literary capacity. When one of their diplo-



matic agents 'goes forth' in the plenitude of his powers, to visit the societies abroad, or to assist in the formation of new ones, he has, we verily believe, no bribes, no remuneration to offer, no titles to confer: he goes to solicit or to advise, but has no power to command. Every such Society on the Continent stands upon its own basis, and is entirely independent of the British and Foreign Bible Society, as to both the appointment of its officers and the management of its affairs. There, as in England, an annual subscription renders a member eligible for any of the offices. The subscribers voluntarily unite for a specific purpose, and choose from among themselves their presidents, directors, and secretaries. The British and Foreign Bible Society have no power to dictate to these Societies any further, than to prescribe, as the condition of our co-operation, that their editions of the Holy Scriptures shall be without note or comment. Their agent has no power to say, as Mr. Haldane would have him: Pastor A. is ineligible, he is suspected to be of Socinian principles;—strike off Professor B., he is an avowed Arian; Count C. is a Neologist, we can have nothing to do with him; Messieurs D. E. and F. 'act more on worldly considerations—*des vues humaines*—than in a true spirit of faith,'—they are too impure a medium for the transmission of the Scriptures to the people. We say, admitting the wisdom and legitimacy of this mode of proceeding, the Committee or its agent has not the power to act thus. Mr. Haldane's picture is, therefore, an imaginary one, bearing no relation to the actual state of things; and his charges against the Directors, therefore, fall to the ground, even supposing his representation of the deplorable character of the foreign societies to be accurate. Of this, indeed, there is happily reason to doubt, from the sweeping nature of his assertions, compared with the meagreness and vagueness of his pretended evidence.

'The state of Bible Societies on the Continent,' he says, 'according to the most recent accounts, is truly deplorable. A well-informed foreigner, who has lately been travelling among them to ascertain in what state they are, gives it as his decided *opinion*, that Christians have *very little weight* in the several committees, which, in general, are wholly under the direction of freethinkers. Such is his *report* of them from one end of the Continent to another.'

This well-informed foreigner, having been apparently sent out (by whom?) to ascertain the state of the continental Bible Societies, comes home to his employers with an *opinion* that *Christians* have *very little weight* in the committees!! It would seem then, that, after all, there are some Christians in

these committees, though they do not form the majority. But was this opinion carefully formed? Was there no previous bias on the mind of this agent? From one end of the Continent to the other includes a considerable tract of country: Did the reporter really traverse it? These questions must be answered, before this anonymous evidence can be deemed of much weight, giving the individual full credit for good intention and veracity. But Mr. Haldane proceeds:

‘Other foreign Christians, who have visited this country, confirm this report, and have given the names of many Arians and Socinians, who are the sole governors of several societies abroad. A few weeks ago, I received the following account of the secretary and treasurer of one of these Bible Societies:—“The Secretary is the idol of the fashionable world here, because, to use the words of the treasurer, he preaches in such a refined style, that none but well educated persons can understand him; and the morality he inculcates is so pure and excellent that it surpasses the precepts of the Bible; he therefore alludes seldom to the Bible, and makes very little use of Biblical expressions.” This secretary affirms that the epistles contradict the gospels. I have myself known a Bible Society abroad, which had for its secretary a Socinian, if he was any thing at all, and who was one of the active agents employed in adulterating the Scriptures by the addition of the Apocrypha, both of which to him were equally indifferent. Of the same society, the treasurer was the avowed author of a large and elaborate book against the Divine origin of the Bible.”

p. 119.

What Mr. Haldane means by an active agent's being ‘employed in adulterating the Scriptures by the addition of the ‘Apocrypha,’ we are really at a loss to determine. Does he mean a printer or a book-binder? We have, in this sense, both at Oxford and Cambridge, active agents employed in this adulteration. But in all the authorised foreign versions, the Apocrypha is included: how then can any individual be actively employed in adding it? Nor is it less mysterious what interest Socinians should have in circulating the Apocryphal books. But waiving this, we would put it to the common candour and common sense of our readers, whether these facts be sufficient to justify Mr. Haldane's sweeping allegations, that ‘over the whole Continent, the *chosen friends* of the British and Foreign Bible Society, those whom it generally appoints or countenances as leaders in the various Bible Societies which it ‘creates,’ are ‘Arians, Socinians, and Freethinkers.’ Do they amount to the slightest proof of this most calumnious, most un-Christian assertion? Of all the enemies that have ever assailed this noble institution, did any one ever venture on so foul, so gratuitous a charge?



From the constitution of the foreign Bible societies, it necessarily results, that their committees are composed, like those of the British societies, the Edinburgh committee not excepted, of individuals differing widely in rank, talent, learning, and religious sentiment, but all agreeing on this one point, that it is a good undertaking to endeavour to supply the poor with copies of the Holy Scriptures. That the Continent is over-run with Arianism is, we fear, but too true; there are consequently Arians and Socinians to be found among the members and even leaders of Bible societies, as well as among the pastors, professors, and ecclesiastical authorities. But that men of piety and devotedness to God are excluded from these committees, that they do not, for the most part, form a fair proportion of them, we believe to be a most untrue and unwarrantable representation. There may, perhaps, be found here and there, an individual of more zeal than wisdom, who, because he cannot carry every thing his own way, has thought proper to turn aside and calumniate the society to which he belonged, and all similar associations; and we cannot answer for it, that there may not be some good men on the Continent, as in England, who for some reason or other stand aloof; we will venture to say, however, that the Rev. Messrs. Chabrand, Marzials, Bonnard, and others, will not thank Mr. Haldane for the manner in which he has made them figure in his pages, as the *only* men in France worthy of being entrusted with the circulation of the Holy Scriptures, to the condemnation of the motives of the vast majority of their colleagues in these associations, and in the ministry of the Protestant churches throughout that kingdom. Mr. Haldane's complaint amounts to neither more nor less than this; that the Bible Society has not, throughout the Continent, raised the standard of *dissent*, and allied itself exclusively to one particular party, in open opposition to the synods, pastors, and collective churches throughout the Protestant world. Our reply is, that such was not the proper business of the Bible Society, nor did it comport with either its object, spirit, or principle. We do not say that the cause of evangelical dissent on the Continent may not be the cause of truth and godliness, or that the foreign churches may not be extensively tainted with heresy;—although we have on record the instructive case of a holy reformer, 'very jealous for the Lord of Hosts,' who thought that he was the only prophet left alive in Israel, and that the whole nation had forsaken the covenant of the Lord, whereas he was told, that seven thousand were left, who had not bowed the knee to Baal. But the distinguishing character of the Bible Society, that on which its unity, its strength, its universality, its perpetuity, and its efficiency alike depend, is, that its

simple object admits of the co-operation of *all* sects and parties, all classes and all creeds,—that is to say, of their co-operation *for the specific object*; and if Socinians and Free-thinkers, Papists or Turks, from whatever motives, choose to join in promoting the circulation of the Holy Scriptures, opposed as *we* deem the Scriptures to be to their tenets and interests, the surrender is on *their* side. That Arians and Socinians are the chosen friends of the British and Foreign Bible Society and its agents on the Continent is, however, just as true, as that they are the leaders and directors of the Bible societies at home, the chosen friends of the London, or of the Edinburgh Committee.

It will be worth while, however, to look a little more narrowly into this gentleman's main argument, that, by conniving at the delivery of the Scriptures to the people through the hands of heterodox persons, we give all the sanction in our power to the characters, opinions, and qualifications of these men as public religious instructors. This objection against the Bible Society has no pretensions to originality. In a somewhat different application, it was worn threadbare in an early stage of the Bible Society controversy. It was urged by our High-Church opponents as an insuperable objection to co-operating with sectaries of all sorts, Methodists, Baptists, Socinians, and others, that the Bible would acquire a taint by passing through so heterodox a medium; and that church-men would be giving a sanction to Dissent, and to the characters and qualifications of Dissenting teachers as public religious instructors, by conniving at the delivery of the Bible to the people through their hands. Thus we find Dr. Wordsworth holding this language: 'The Dissenters have succeeded in drawing us down from our vantage-ground, to put off our armour, even to slight and despise it, and to place ourselves side by side with the lowest of their sects.\*' And Mr. Sikes objects, that, though the Society in its collective capacity gives the Bible without comment, yet, as it gives it *through the hands* of its various members, and some of them may be *Socinians, Calvinists, or Quakers*, they may circulate it with tracts and comments, or with 'a commentary in their mouth,' so as to make it speak 'Socinianism, Calvinism, or Quakerism.' The same gentleman has also anticipated Mr. Haldane in another of his objections. 'In the sacred history,' he remarks, 'whenever it is proposed by Providence to propagate the gospel, it is done, not merely by

---

\* See "Reasons for declining to become a Subscriber to the Bible Society." By Christ. Wordsworth, D.D. &c. 1810; and "Letter to Lord Teignmouth in Vindication of Reasons," &c. p. 113.



dispersing copies of the Scriptures, but by the instrumentality of authorised ministers who bring the Scriptures in their hands. When Cornelius was favoured with a heavenly vision, his directions were not to send and procure the Scriptures, but "send to Joppa and call for one Simon, whose surname is Peter; he will tell thee what thou oughtest to do." And who was this Peter? no lay-preacher, no leader of a sect or schism. He was a regularly ordained minister of the church.\* How are the tables turned! Who would have expected to find a secretary, a schismatic (in the view of these gentlemen), and a leading member of a Bible Committee, making use of the same argument as a reason against sanctioning the circulation of the Scriptures through the medium of regularly ordained ministers and pastors of established churches? On the part of the clerical opponents of the Bible Society, these reasonings were at the time supposed to indicate an unworthy jealousy of the sufficiency of the Scriptures, a spirit of illiberality and intolerance, a paramount anxiety to promote the interests of their own church or party at the expense of the higher considerations of Christian charity. But we must have been mistaken. Narrow views and strong prejudices cannot have influenced Dr. Wordsworth, Mr. Sikes, Mr. Spry, and others, in urging these apparently unreasonable and illiberal objections; for they are precisely the same as Mr. Haldane's. We imagined those persons to be hostile to the whole constitution and plan of the Bible Society: yet, if so, in what does Mr. Haldane's friendship differ from their hostility?

But let us look at the argument a little closer. Arians, Socinians, and Free-thinkers are improper persons to be allowed to co-operate in delivering the Scriptures: and upon this ground, Mr. Haldane tells us, the 'right feeling priests' of the Romish Church refuse to join the Bible Society. These Romish priests take exactly the same view of the plan of the Society, it seems, as Dr. Wordsworth, Mr. Sikes, and Mr. Haldane do. A singular alliance, but no matter. We wish to ask, whether Mr. Haldane's Roman Catholic friends would allow Quakers, who deny the Sacraments, or Scotch Sandemanians to be proper persons to unite with in delivering the Bible to the people. We trow not. We are sceptical whether the 'right feeling' of many of these priests would admit of their cordially uniting with such heretics as Richard Phillips and Luke Howard. But we must take the liberty of putting another question to Mr. Haldane, and in his own words: 'Is it to

---

\* See *Eclectic Rev.* Old Series, Vol. VII. p. 262.

‘be connived at, that the Scriptures shall be delivered to the people through the hands of’ *Papists*, any more than through those of Arians, Socinians, and Neologists,—‘thus giving all the sanction in our power to the characters, opinions, and qualifications of’ right-feeling or wrong-feeling priests of the corrupt Church of Rome, ‘as public religious instructors?’ We know not with what consistency Mr. Haldane could consent to such fraternal co-operation. But, if the hands of *Papists* be too impure a medium, and it be thought that the waters of life will acquire a deleterious quality in passing through so polluted a conduit, the hands of the Greek clergy and the Syrian clergy are not a whit cleaner. Is it then, we again ask, to be connived at, that the Scriptures shall be delivered to the people of France and Switzerland through the hands of Arianized Presbyterians; to the people of Germany, through the hands of free-thinking Lutherans; to the people of Russia, through the hands of the idolatrous Greek clergy; to the people of Mexico, Colombia, Peru, and Brazil, through the hands of monks, friars, and Romish ecclesiastics; to the people of England through the hands of that motley and heretical body, the Earl-street Committee? Down with such a system. The only fit persons to deliver the Scriptures to the world are Mr. Haldane, Dr. Thomson, Messrs. Chabrand, Marzials, Bonnard, and others hereafter to be named by the Continental Society and the Edinburgh Committee.

We have heard—perhaps Mr. Haldane may have heard—of a little sect that sprang up in this kingdom not a century ago, who carried their jealousy of fraternal co-operation with the non-elect to that height, that their rules did not allow any of their members to join in prayer with a person not of their persuasion. It strikes us, that the not suffering a person of heretical principles to join with us in distributing the word of God, savours not a little of the same pharisaical spirit. But there is no accounting for the eccentricities of zeal. We have heard of a sage proposal to open all the meetings of the Earl-street Committee with a religious service;—whether a form of prayer, or extemporaneous prayer, we are not informed, and therefore cannot tell whether this pious manœuvre was intended to disgust any of the clergy, or to get rid of the Quakers. But the fact is, that the catholic spirit of the Bible Society is the grand stumbling block to all those worthy and well meaning persons whose minds are essentially sectarian. Mr. Haldane thinks all this peace and union a very bad sign of the times. ‘If discussions and differences of opinion be not excited by giving men the Bible,’ he says, ‘it is owing either to its being neglected, or to their mistaking the religion it incul-



'cates.' This, we admit, is true to a certain degree, but it is a truth bordering on a most pernicious doctrine. The tendency of the doctrines of the Bible is, to make men agree, to promote peace, unity, and good-will. And though our blessed Lord declared that he came not to send peace, but a sword, intimating that his followers must be prepared to encounter the world's hatred and domestic persecution and treachery for his name's sake, the New Testament contains no passage which should warrant the idea, that to court persecution, to provoke controversy, and to excite opposition and discord, is the duty of a Christian, or the readiest way to advance the kingdom of righteousness and peace.

But our readers must by this time be convinced, that the objections taken by Mr. Haldane and his friends against the administration of the Bible Society by the Earl-street Committee and its foreign agents, strike at the very principle and constitution of the Society itself. Nothing can be more opposite than the system of union and co-operation which has hitherto been considered as the glory of the Bible Society, and that which Mr. Haldane would substitute for it. Yet, these are the gentlemen who clamour for an adherence to the constitution and rules of the Society! 'Thy rowers have brought thee into deep waters,' pathetically exclaims Mr. Haldane; and this new pilot would steer back the Society into the narrow pool of theological debate. These rowers have for twenty years navigated every sea, and left blessings in every port; and are they now to be discharged, that the vessel may be cut down to a floating ark, or towed along by Mr. Haldane's favourite vessel, the Continental Society?—No, never.

We suspected from the first, that the objection to the circulation of the Apocrypha had something behind it. We might now safely appeal to our readers, whether we were wrong. But it remains to prove, from the pamphlets before us, the real source and bearings of the opposition of the Edinburgh Committee. We have seen what are Mr. Haldane's enlarged views of co-operation, and they will serve not a little to illustrate the following paragraph from Dr. Thomson's statement.

'We cannot safely or properly co-operate with any Society or individual agent that does not acknowledge the same canon of Scripture. And as one proof of their holding the same canon of Scripture, they must practically refrain from circulating the Apocrypha with the Bible, whether it be appended, or whether it be interspersed. If they hold a different canon, or if they act in the distribution of the Bible as if they did so, inserting in the same volume with the Word of God, that which is not the Word of God, then, to employ them as our

agents for carrying into effect the purposes of our Bible Society, is so far to give our countenance to an adulteration of the words of eternal life, and to enable others to give a wider spread to spurious editions of the Holy Scriptures.' p. 136.

The plain meaning of this is, that the Committee ought to break with every national church in the world, except the Church of Scotland, and become undisguisedly a sectarian, in this country a Dissenting Society. We do not wonder that Mr. Craig, as an episcopalian, had some scruples as to adopting a statement containing such a proposition as this. We should extremely like to see how Mr. Gorham would look on reading it. To be eligible as a member of a Bible Society that shall secure the co-operation of Dr. Thomson and his friends, a person must practically refrain from circulating the Bible as printed by the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and as appointed to be read in churches,—that is to say, with the Apocrypha;—the Bible as circulated (to a great extent) by the Bartlett's Buildings Society,—the Bible as it exists (*horribile dictu!*) not only on the reading-desks of Episcopal churches, but in a very large proportion of Dissenting pulpits. Yes, the alarming truth must be told. All the copies of the Quarto editions of the Holy Scriptures issued by the Clarendon, and (if we mistake not) the Cambridge press, include the Apocrypha; and although the pernicious appendage admits of being cancelled, we speak from a pretty extensive knowledge of fact, when we say, that the pulpit Bibles in Dissenting chapels will usually be found to contain the Apocrypha. Every Bible that is used in the reading-desks of the Established Church *must* contain it. Nay, more; we never heard a conscientious objection raised by a single English Dissenter of any denomination to this inclusion of the Apocryphal books between the two boards of the Bible. Against the practice of the Church of England in directing lessons to be read from the Apocrypha, as we stated in a former article, the Nonconformist Commissioners who assisted at the Savoy Conference, firmly and conscientiously protested;\* and the Dis-

---

\* Yet, their language (as cited in our September Number) is remarkable. 'We asked not,' they say in reply, 'that no Apocryphal chapter may be read in the church, but that none may be read as lessons: to read them in the same place, under the same title, without any sufficient note of distinction, or notice given to the people that they are not canonical Scripture, *they being also bound with our Bibles*, is such a temptation to the vulgar to take them for God's word, as doth much prevail, and is like to do so still.' Could they have contemplated their exclusion from the Bible, when,



senters of the present day still rank this among their objections to the ritual of the Establishment. Many clergymen, we are aware, evade or disobey this direction,—on their own responsibility; but that is not our affair. But as to the insertion of the Apocrypha in the same volume with the canonical books, we cannot discover that, either by our Nonconformist ancestors, or by any existing denomination of English Dissenters, it was ever objected to as *unlawful*. That it was extensively disliked,—that it was deemed inexpedient, especially in the case of editions designed for circulation among the lower classes,—and that the practice of omitting the Apocryphal books has been silently gaining ground among both churchmen and dissenters, so that even the English Universities have, we understand, in some instances, followed the example set them by the King's Printer, by omitting it in small editions,—all this we admit. We believe that the Apocrypha in this country was in a fair way to die a natural death, having no spiritual life in it. And the same consequence would result from the diffusion of Scriptural light in other countries: the Apocryphal books would first sink into disuse, and at length be silently and gradually dropped out of the holy volume. But we repeat that, to the best of our knowledge and belief, the lawfulness of inserting it was never questioned, before this new article of faith was promulgated by the Edinburgh Committee. Even the Confession of the Church of Scotland is silent on this head. And not only Church Bibles and Dissenting pulpit Bibles, but the family Bibles of Dissenters, at least those of venerable date, will in general be found to contain the Apocrypha.

Upon what principle, then, is it now demanded, that every member, whether of the Church of England, the Church of France, or any other Protestant, Papal, Greek, or other foreign communion, shall practically refrain from circulating the Apocrypha with the Bible, in order to be deemed worthy to co-operate in the delivery of the Scriptures to the people? Let it be known, that this indecent, this intolerant demand does not proceed from any body of English Dissenters. We love the Apocrypha just as little as does Dr. Andrew Thomson; but we say, that this is not the way to get rid of it, nor the way to advance the cause of the Bible Society, or the circulation of God's Holy Word.

The question of the Canon is not now before us,—among Protestants, that has never been a question,—but the *lawfulness* of circulating what is admitted and declared *not* to be ca-

---

with this qualification of announcing them to be apocryphal, they would have consented to their being occasionally read in the church?

nonical, as an appendage to the inspired books. And we must take the freedom to ask, how any clergymen of the Established Church can with the least shew of consistency maintain the negative? \* How would the proposal to exclude the Apocrypha from all copies of the Bible issued by the Venerable Society, be received at Bartlett's Buildings? Can it be imagined that it would ever receive the countenance of the dignitaries of the Establishment? And yet, it is pretended, that the laws of the British and Foreign Bible Society were framed with the express intention to secure its exclusion from every copy of the Scriptures issued by any Bible Society whatever throughout Christendom! We deny, not inerey that this was the fact, but that it could possibly be the fact. Had such an intention existed, Mr. Hughes, who has perhaps the best claim to be considered as the founder of the Society, could not have forgotten it; and *he* says, the design was never contemplated. Had it existed, further, it must have been known to its earliest patrons; and we feel confident that Bishop Porteus and the other prelates who gave the infant Institution their cordial support, would never, in that case, have sanctioned a regulation at once so invidious and sectarian. But the extension of this exclusion to all foreign versions would have been considered, at the formation of the society, too chimerical an idea to be entertained for a moment. We say boldly, therefore, that it could not have been contemplated; in proof of which, we may refer to the *very first grant* made to a foreign Bible Society, that of Nuremburg. This was announced in connexion with the remark, that it was hoped, the same Society would 'soon have it in its power to print a large edition of the *established* Lutheran Bible complete,'† which established Lutheran Bible was known to contain the Apocrypha. In the Appendix to the same Report (1805) is inserted a

---

\* We have already had occasion to cite the words of Bp. Cosin, whose History of the Canon has been so repeatedly referred to in the present discussion. In stating the inquiry, he says: 'The Question will not be, 1. Whether those Apocryphal books either have been heretofore, or may still be read in the Church for the better instruction and edifying of the people in many good precepts of life. 2. Nor whether they may be joined together in one common volume with the Bible, and comprehended under the general name of Holy Scripture, as that name is largely and improperly taken.' After mentioning three other particulars, he adds—'all this we grant. And to all these purposes, there may be good use made of an Apocryphal book' p. 8.

† First Report, p. 13.



letter from a Roman Catholic Priest in Swabia to the Rev. Dr. Steinkopff, in which there is the following passage. 'Your question respecting the Catholics inspires me with the hope that your Society is desirous to extend its beneficial influence likewise to the Catholics, wishing only to know whether a dispersion of Bibles among them would be practicable; and indeed, it would not only be practicable, but desirable in the highest degree. Let me, however, candidly observe, that a Protestant edition of the Bible would hardly be suffered to have its free course, after all I know of the minds of most of the Catholic people or clergy. It ought, therefore, to be either a Catholic edition of the Bible, or, if a Protestant, it ought to have the same appearance as if printed in a Catholic town: for instance, the books of the Bible ought to be placed in an order different from that which is generally adopted in Protestant Bibles.\* Will it be said, that here is no mention made of any thing beyond a different order or arrangement? The reason is obvious: the only Protestant Bibles known in Swabia contained the Apocryphal books, and all the difference between the Protestant and the Catholic editions consisted in the arrangement. The subsequent application of this Roman Catholic priest for Catholic *Testaments*, was, after deliberate consideration, declined, objections being taken to the *version*. Mr. Gorham, however, in his 'accurate' statement, argues, that 'the encouragement held out in 1804, '5, by the Committee, to Protestant Societies which were about to print the Lutheran, the Bohemian, the Polish, and the Lithuanian Bibles, by no means implies that it was understood that the Apocrypha should be annexed to those editions, if printed by our aid.' What then, were the Committee ignorant of the fact, that those Bibles contained the Apocrypha? If not, how could it fail to be understood, that the usual form of printing the Bible should be adhered to? But this gentleman's proofs of the intention to exclude are not a little singular. 'At a Committee-meeting, Nov. 5, 1810, it was "agreed to omit the Apocrypha," annexed to the Oxford Septuagint, fifty copies of which were sent to India.' And again, 'a Sub-committee, in Sept. 1811, "agreed to omit the Apocrypha," in reprinting the German Bible from the Halle edition.' Let any man of common sense determine, whether such minutes could possibly have been made, or such an agreement have been come to by a Sub-committee, if the rules of the Society peremptorily deprived the Committee of all

---

\* First Report, p. 36.

option or discretion in the business. In 1812, it being discovered that the Bohemian and other editions of the German Bible contained *prefaces and glossaries* besides the Apocrypha, a circular letter to the Continental societies was resolved on, stating 'the necessity of carrying into effect the fundamental law of this Society relative to the printing and publishing the Scriptures without note or comment.' It has been absurdly pretended, that the Apocrypha was included under the words note and comment,—an assertion quite on a par with the sage remark of Mr. Norris, that a translation is a comment, 'the version produced being neither more nor less than the translator's exposition.' The hollowness of this pretence will at once be seen on considering, 1. That the occasion of the circular letter was not the insertion of the Apocrypha, which was long before known to be the case in all the 'established' German Bibles, but the introduction of prefaces and glossaries. 2. That had the circular been intended to apply to the Apocrypha, it would not have been necessary to direct Dr. Steinkopff, in his subsequent visit to the Continental societies, to urge on them the omission of the Apocrypha.

But both Dr. Thomson and his new friend Mr. Gorham have disingenuously endeavoured to confound two things essentially different,—the wish of the London Committee to exclude the Apocrypha, and their supposed conviction that its circulation was forbidden by the laws of the Institution. Whereas nothing is more clear from the whole history of their proceedings, than that they were unanimously desirous of obtaining the omission of the Apocrypha, and as unanimously persuaded that the role of the Society did not render this peremptory. Dr. Thomson asks :

'If it be really true, that they were not bound by the laws of the Society to abstain from circulating the apocrypha; and if it be really true, that its circulation is so necessary as they allege for the circulation of the Holy Scriptures on the Continent; have they done right in agreeing to relinquish the practice, so far as they have agreed to relinquish it in some of their resolutions?'

We challenge Dr. Thomson to adduce the slightest proof of a disinclination in the Committee, at any period, to relinquish this practice,—or, to speak more properly, to promote the relinquishment of this practice on the part of foreign churches. But could they have no other motive than the principle of obedience to their own laws? Who would imagine, from Dr. Thomson's statement, that the very individuals who framed those laws, ranked among the members of the Committee whose secret opposition to the laws is thus ungenerously insi-



nanted? If the laws were framed to exclude the Apocrypha, must it not have been the wish of the Committee to exclude it in practice? But they who framed the laws had not so bound themselves, and therefore we find them subsequently agreeing to omit, and urging others to omit the Apocryphal books. What inconsistency or ambiguity is there in this conduct? As a matter of economy, to take the lowest consideration, such omission was expedient. To prevent any interruption of unanimity in this country, either within the Committee or out of it, was another powerful inducement. But above all, the home practice justifies the belief, that it was the wish of the original promoters of the Bible Society, (so far as the subject was the matter of distinct consideration,) tacitly to get rid of the spurious appendage, but without stigmatising it in a manner that should give umbrage to members of the Established Church, and of other religious institutions by whom the Apocrypha is freely circulated. If there has been any thing approaching to concealment on the part of the Parent Committee, it relates, not to their tolerating the circulation of the Apocrypha by foreign societies,—which was a notorious fact,—but to their wish and determination to exclude it;—of which, had it been known, Mr. Sikes, Dr. Wordsworth, Bp. Marsh, and their other clerical antagonists would not have failed to make a handle, in order to excite the jealousy of every true churchman against the sectarian society. ‘Had they proposed to combine the circulation of the Apocrypha with that of the Bible,’ exclaims Dr. Thomson, ‘how few, comparatively speaking, could they have hoped to associate with them in their undertaking!’ Had it been proposed formally and absolutely to exclude the Apocrypha, our belief is, that their associates would have been still fewer, and that the Institution would always have been as contracted in its sphere of operation, and as sectarian in its character, as Dr. Thomson could wish it to become.

The length to which these remarks have already extended, compel us to pass over many points which we had intended to notice; but we must now briefly advert to the awful representations and denunciations of our Edinburgh Reformers as to the sin and danger of circulating the Apocrypha in any form. For be it remembered, that Mr. Gorham’s distinction is now given up as frivolous, and to circulate the Apocrypha in the same volume with the Sacred Scriptures under any circumstances, is declared to be both perilous and criminal.

First, as to its sinfulness. This charge rests on two distinct grounds: the one is, that we thereby add to the word of God, what is no part of the word of God; the other is, that we bind

up with the inspired Scriptures, human writings which are admitted and declared in the volume we send out, not to be the word of God.

To prove the wickedness of adding to the word of God, Mr. Haldane has recourse, very unnecessarily, to an untenable and dangerous hypothesis and three inapplicable citations from Scripture. We say unnecessarily, because no Protestant that we ever heard of would contend, that it is any thing short of impious in the highest degree wilfully to add to the word of God. But we should be very sorry to rest the cause which Mr. Haldane advocates, on his theory of inspiration. Not only does he contend for the highest degree of plenary inspiration, but he represents it to be a most erroneous idea, 'that the Scriptures are written under different degrees of inspiration.' By this plenary inspiration, claimed for the Scriptures, he understands, 'the infusion of ideas and words into the minds of the writers by the operation of God.' In this literal sense, he ascribes to every book in the sacred canon, an equal claim to the title of the word of God. Having adverted to this wild dogma in a preceding article, we shall content ourselves with affirming in this place, that it is at variance with the opinions of learned, pious, and orthodox divines of all parties, at variance with internal evidence, and at variance with common sense. The dangerous tendency of such sentiments has been ably pointed out by our admirable Doddridge. Speaking of the highest kind of inspiration, that of immediate suggestion, he says: 'That this is applicable to all the history of it (the New Testament), or to all things contained in its epistolary parts, I choose not to assert. For, as it cannot be necessary to its entire *credibility*, (which nothing can more effectually secure than a full superintendency,) it would subject us to so many difficulties, which have been so forcibly urged by others, that it is not necessary for me to repeat them here. But I am well assured, that the apparent insufficiency of the answers which have been returned to these objections by some very sincere but (I think in this instance) less judicious defenders of Scripture, has led some people to conclude that the Scripture was not inspired at all: as if it had been on both sides agreed, that a universal suggestion was the only kind of inspiration worth contending for.' . . . Referring to one class of these objections he adds: 'With which I have no concern, because they affect only such a degree of inspiration as I think it not *prudent*, and am sure it is not *necessary*, to assert. I leave them therefore to be answered by those, *if any such there be*, who imagine that Paul would need an immediate revelation from heaven, and a miraculous dictate of the Holy Ghost, to remind Timothy



of the cloak and writings which he left at Troas, or to advise him to mingle a little wine with his water\*.

Even had Mr. Haldane's notion of Inspiration recommended itself by an accordance with reason and Scripture, his introduction of it in the present discussion would not have been very judicious, since his own creed in these matters cannot be allowed to form either the basis or the interpreter of the laws of the British and Foreign Bible Society. As to the texts which he cites, taken in their letter, they cannot by possibility be made to apply to such additions to the Bible as do not lay claim to the character of God's word. But with Mr. Haldane's views, we do not see how he can dare circulate a copy of the Bible that contains the spurious, false, apocryphal subscriptions appended to some of the epistles, and the spurious, apocryphal insertion in the fifth chapter of the first epistle of John†. His reasoning, to be valid, must apply to verses and words, and to erroneous renderings, as well as to entire chapters or books. In fact, the Edinburgh Committee take to themselves high merit for having made a stand against the crying sin of marginal renderings and references, and arguments at the beginning of each chapter; and Dr Thomson has exerted all his ingenuity to make some of these speak the language of Church-of-Englandism or heresy. Were the subject less grave, this display of pettifoggish criticism would be simply amusing.

The second ground of sinfulness, is, the unlawfulness of inserting writings which are declared to be apocryphal, in the same volume with the inspired Scriptures. To those who know us, we need not repeat, that we regard the practice as highly inexpedient, and that the total separation and abolition of the Apocrypha is a consummation devoutly to be wished. But when gentlemen begin to talk of its being 'a daring imputation on God's word,' a 'presumptuous invasion of consecrated ground, an adulteration, a corruption, a degradation, a counteraction of Divine Revelation, a crime bordering on blasphemy,'—we must pause and ask, Who is it that these courageous men are thus charging foolishly? The learned, and wise, and holy of Christ's Church of every nation and communion, since the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were first collected into a volume. This 'profane' practice has obtained the concurrence of Luther, of Calvin,

\* Doddridge's Family Expositor. Vol. III. (8vo. 1810.) pp. 324, 340. See also Note at the end of this Article.

† Possibly, this verse may be held by Mr. Haldane to be genuine, and the remark will only be set down against us as another mark of heresy; but ought it not to be required then of all members of Bible Committees, that they believe in the inspiration of 1 John v. 7?

of the English Translators, of the Church of England, of the Synod of Dort, and of every Protestant Church in Christendom;—for we cannot allow a Church that has sanctioned the annexation of a metrical Version of the Psalms to the Holy Scriptures, to lay claim to exception. Whatever mode of distinguishing or separating the Apocryphal books may have been adopted, whatever objection may have been felt to their annexation, whatever wish expressed that they had never been joined, *the lawfulness of connecting them in one and the same volume has never till now been questioned.* Bishop Cosin says, it is no question between the Papists and the Protestants. The Savoy Commissioners admit, that it is no question between the Church of England and the Nonconformists. The Synod of Dort say: ‘The discarding of these books from the volume of the Bible has not been sanctioned by the example or votes of other Reformed Churches, and might give *occasion of offence or calumny.*’ The Universities of England hold it to be lawful. The practice of the Bartlett’s Buildings Society vouches for the concurrent sentiments of every prelate on the bench. Every foreign Protestant communion deems it lawful. Every authorized version includes the Apocrypha. Every Biblical translator, therefore, has so far set his seal to the lawfulness of the practice. - Now if, in the face of all these facts, the British and Foreign Bible Society are to be charged by a knot of gentlemen at Edinburgh with criminally corrupting the holy communication of Heaven, because they have, to a certain extent, tolerated the universal practice of foreign churches, we must ask, Who has constituted them the theological arbiters of Christendom? \* Here is a Society which has silently and peaceably done more towards the separation of the apocryphal

---

\* Dr. Thomson attempts to make out an honourable exception in favour of the American Bible Societies, which affords an additional proof that the boldness of his statements is not in exact proportion to their accuracy. ‘The American Institutions print and circulate the Holy Scriptures without the Apocrypha, without heads of chapters, or marginal references, without note or comment, or addition of any description; and they call these, because they believe them to be, the word of God. This,’ he adds, ‘*is the fact*; and we mention it to the distinguishing honour of our Transatlantic brethren.’ p. 66. That this is *not* the fact, we have evidence now before us. Among the other instances of wicked conduct on the part of the Earl-street Committee, the reverend gentleman adduces their printing a *Spanish Bible*, containing the Apocrypha profanely *intermingled* with the Canonical books. What will be his horror at learning, that this identical Spanish Bible has been printed by the American Bible Society at New York, in the same form, and as recently as the year 1824? We might fairly presume that this is not a solitary instance, but we content ourselves with leaving this fact to speak for itself.



from the canonical books within twenty years, than had been done by all the Reformers and Translators of past ages; and they are to be reproached and criminated for an attachment to the Apocrypha! And clergymen of the Church of England, too, can join in denouncing the conduct of the Bible Society for tolerating its circulation *abroad*, while they are themselves found members of the Bartlett's Buildings Society, which circulates it *at home*, and while they are compelled to read portions of that same Apocrypha in the house of God!!

‘How complicate, how wonderful is man!’

If it be impious to join human writings confessedly uninspired to the canonical books in the same volume, we do not see how it can be held lawful to print human notes and expositions in the same volume with the sacred text. Possibly, Mr. Haldane may deem this also ‘a daring imputation on God’s word, as if it were not perfect and complete in itself.’ We have no wish to press too hard upon this gentleman, but this seems the legitimate consequence of his reasonings; and the grounds of the imputed unlawfulness will require to be much more distinctly made out and defined, before we shall be able to tell, whether Thomas Scott and Matthew Henry were not invading consecrated ground in binding up their notes and comments with the word of God.

We shall say a very few words on the alleged *danger* of circulating the Apocrypha, first, because our wish to see it totally suppressed, wherever this concession can be obtained, springs from the belief that evil consequences may arise from its circulation; secondly, because we are sick of encountering the heated exaggerations on this subject, by which it has been attempted to inflame the public mind. We shall content ourselves with two remarks. The first is, that it is altogether *untrue*, that the Church of Rome builds the doctrines of purgatory, penance, atonement by alms-deeds, relics, &c. on the Apocryphal writings exclusively, or even mainly; nor would the loss of the Apocrypha deprive its priests of the deeper artifice of quoting, in defence of their doctrines, the Canonical Scriptures. In support of the doctrine of Purgatory, they cite 1 Cor. iii. 15. Matt. iii. 11. v. 27. xii. 32. 1 Cor. xv. 29, and Mark ix. 48. In support of the worship of saints and angels, they cite Rev. iii. 9. 2 Kings ii. 15. Josh. v. 14. Job v. 1. Psalm cxxxviii. 1. Gen. xlviii. 15. Zach. i. 12. Jer. xv. 1. and Luke vii. 3—9. In defence of the worship of relics, they cite the honour paid to the Ark, especially 1 Sam. v. 4. and Heb. ix. 4.; the virtue of Elijah’s cloak, 2 Kings ii. 13.; and of his bones, xiii. 20.; of the hem of our Lord’s garment, Matt. ix. 21.; of napkins applied to Paul’s body, Acts xix. 12.; of Peter’s shadow, v. 5.; also Luke vi. 19. John i.

27. and Heb. xi. 21. To give one more specimen, (and all these are taken from the works of Roman Catholic writers now before us,) satisfactory and meritorious works are defended by 2 Cor. vi. 4. Luke ii. 37. Col. i. 24. Gen. iv. 7. Psalm xviii. 20. xix. 11. 1 Kings viii. 32. Matt. v. 12. vi. 20. x. 42. xvi. 27. xix. 27. xxv. 23. 34, &c. Mark x. 21. John v. 29. Luke xiv. 14. 1 Cor. iii. 8. 2 Cor. iv. 17. 2 Cor. ix. 6, 10. Gal. vi. 9. Eph. vi. 8. 1 Tim. vi. 17. Rev. xxii. 12. and several others. To the reference to 2 Cor. ix. 6, is added: 'Note here, *alms-deeds made the seed of glory.*' Now let any reader turn to these passages, and judge whether, in the hands of a skilful casuist, they would not be far more available than any thing that could be obtained from all the Apocryphal books put together,—more especially, with the clenching remark: 'these are the Scriptures admitted by Protestants.' It must be then either through consummate ignorance or to answer the purpose of delusion, that such exaggerated statements are put forth as to the support afforded to Popery by the Apocrypha.

One more remark, and we have done. 'Grant me the Apocrypha as a part of the inspired volume,' said a speaker lately in one of the Bible Committees, 'and with this engine I will undertake to overturn all the fundamental doctrines of the word of God, and in their stead to establish every heresy which disfigures the Church of Rome.' This rash and empty vaunt is cited by Mr. Haldane with approbation; and he adds, 'Once possessed of this mongrel book, the fortress of the man of sin is impregnable.' Did Luther find it so? Did the Apocrypha prevent the Reformation? Has it prevented the spread of evangelical truth in the Church of England? How are we to reconcile such assertions as these with even a right faith in the efficacy of God's word, and a devout reference to the Holy Spirit? Much less, with those notions which Mr. Haldane advocates, relative to the pre-eminent necessity and efficiency of an evangelical ministry? Little does he think, that he is himself serving the cause of the Man of Sin far more directly by attempting to weaken and cripple the Bible Society, than the Apocrypha can ever be made to do. Give us the Bible, we say, with or without the Apocrypha, and we will soon shake the Man of Sin out of his fortress, and cause him to tremble on all his seven hills.

We have raised our feeble voice once more—we hope for the last time—in opposition to the clamour which has so strangely been raised with the view to frighten the Bible Society from its proper sphere and steady, magnificent course. Individually, though claiming the privilege of the craft in speaking *quasi ex cathedra*, we claim no other attention than may be conceded to an ardent friend and not inactive member of the noblest Institution which God has ever been pleased to raise up and to



honour. If we might be permitted to address one word, in conclusion, to the London Committee, it would be to warn them how they take the next step towards concession. Union is not always strength : a forced combination at all events will issue in weakness. We should presume that the fundamental law of the Society will not be amended, without ascertaining the extent of the sacrifice of patronage and co-operation which it may cost to propitiate the malcontents. Dissenters as we are, we would not part with a prelate, nor even a dean, to regain the services of Dr. Andrew Thomson himself. Let the Apocrypha be given up, and we shall unfeignedly rejoice at it, if it can be done without affecting the catholic character, narrowing the basis, contracting the sphere, or obstructing the further progress of the Institution either as a *British* or a *Foreign* Society.

NOTE.

We had intended to enter more at large into the subject of the Canon, but our limits forbid. We must, however, briefly advert to the statements made in our former article, for the purpose of repelling some fresh calumnies brought against the Eclectic Reviewer by Mr. Gorham. In a Letter addressed to the Editor of the Christian Guardian, he says : ' The backneyed nature of this Writer's objections does not merit a reply : every one of them (in almost the identical words of the Reviewer) was advanced so long ago as 1685, by that ingenious but unsound Author, Le Clerc, from whose Letters concerning the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, these stale arguments have found their way into the Eclectic of 1825. Le Clerc, and therefore the Eclectic Reviewer, was well answered in 1692 by Mr. Lowth.'

Le Clerc's book we have never seen, but Lowth's Answer we have since obtained ; and it enables us to detect the utter faithlessness of this representation. We transcribe a few sentences from this Answer to Le Clerc, which bear on the subject of inspiration. ' As to the historical writings, I agree with him thus far, that the sacred Historians were not usually inspired with the things themselves which they relate, nor with the words by which they expressed the things. But I think I have proved, that a book may be written by God's direction, and yet, not without the use of human means.....It is highly probable, that the Prophets usually writ the histories of their kings, and those books which are so often quoted under the name of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah and Israel, and were annals whence the substance of the Books of Chronicles are taken. ....If we lay all these things together, the character of the compilers of these historical books, the matter and design of them, the authority of the Jewish Canon, and above all, that of Christ and his Apostles, these are sufficient inducements to believe these books to be written by God's direction for the benefit of the church. And this, I think, is enough to give Divine Authority to an historical book, though neither the matter nor words of it be indited by Inspiration.' pp. 195—200.

With regard to the Book of Esther, in common with every

judicious Expositor that we are acquainted with, Mr. Lowth contents himself with defending its authenticity as 'a true history;' and as to the book of Job, he takes *lower* ground than the Eclectic Reviewer has done, resolving its inspiration into its being written by God's direction for the use of the Church.

Dr. Andrew Thomson is, we suspect, better informed on the subject than Mr. Gorham; for, though he flourishes about our 'profane dogmas concerning Inspiration' and our 'heretical sentiments,' he seems to betray a consciousness that our sentiments have been held by men whom it is not very creditable to any scholar or any man of true piety to speak lightly of. Mr. Gorham's want of information is his best apology for every thing but his bad temper. We cannot admit even of that apology, however, for his reiterated mis-statements. Following this gentleman, Dr. Thomson is anxious to proclaim, that our 'doubts extend to no fewer than ten books or three hundred and forty chapters of the Holy Scriptures.' Much reason as we have to complain of this gentleman's treatment of the Bible Society, we believe that he will regret having inadvertently lent himself to the proclamation of a gross untruth. Our doubts related to the inspiration (by which we understand more than mere superintendence or general direction, authority or truth) of the Book of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, Esther, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Solomon's Song, *six* books of the hagiographa, or *eight* according to the modern arrangement, including *one* hundred and forty-nine chapters. That all these books were written under the *highest* kind of inspiration, no expositor or biblical critic who ranks as an authority, will be found to maintain. Many writers appear to have used the term inspired in a loose sense, as implying little more than *sacred* and *authentic*. In this sense, we believe every book in the Canon to have an equal claim to rank there; but objecting as we do to this application of the term inspiration, we repeat our assertion (and challenge Dr. Thomson to prove it to be heretical), that it is possible that *some* of these may *not* be inspired. That they would not have been received into the Jewish canon, had they not been dictated by immediate inspiration, is a gratuitous assumption. That they are there, is a proof that they *ought* to be there, sanctioned as that Canon is by our Lord and his apostles; but it does not form a proof that they were prophetic writings, which, in the judgement of the Jews themselves, they were not. How the Law and the Prophets can be considered as *adulterated* by the annexation of so invaluable a document as Esther, for example, even though uninspired, surpasses our discernment.

Towards Mr. Gorham, we had no other than a kind feeling, till he met our courtesy with ill-breeding, and our statements with calumnies and gross misrepresentations. As an excuse for his own ungentlemanly conduct, he now pretends to doubt the sincerity of those expressions of respect which he has so ill-justified. But we cannot enter into a war of personalities, and though, by the publication of his own note, we could expose him, we refrain. We admit that his conduct has excited our scorn, but we regard him still as a well-meaning, pious, though ill-tempered man; and if he will publish another topographical work equal to his History of St. Neots, we will not withhold from it our cordial praise.